H Q
766
C777b
1923

BIRTH CONTROL

By

JOHN M. COOPER, PH. D.

Associate Professor of Sociology, Catholic University of America

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL
1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

HQ 766 C777b 1923

02531110R

NLM 05017476 4

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

THE ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY, Washington, D.C.

U. S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

BIRTH CONTROL

By

JOHN M. COOPER, PH. D.

Associate Professor of Sociology, Catholic University of America

HSCD

September, 1923

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL
1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

HQ
766
C777b
1923
c.1

Nihil Obstat:

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur:

✠ MICHAEL J. CURLEY, D.D.,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

Copyright, 1923, by
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL

INTRODUCTION

IN recent years, press, platform, and mouth-to-mouth propaganda have dragged the subject of family limitation or birth control out of the cupboards of decent reserve into the glaring light of day. No apology, therefore, is necessary for presenting a frank discussion of the topic from the Catholic standpoint. Indeed, an apology would be needed for not doing so. Nor does a Catholic discussion of birth control call for any labored introduction. The subject has already been amply and, many of us think, too amply introduced.

We may, therefore, proceed without further words to our question. We shall, in the opening chapter, outline briefly the Catholic standpoint on the subject, and shall then, in the succeeding chapters, review some of the chief grounds that underlie this standpoint.

We desire meanwhile to take this opportunity to express our grateful acknowledgment for the many valuable suggestions given generously in the preparation of this study by the Rev. Aloysius P. Brosnan, S.J., the Very Rev. Dr. John A. Ryan, the Rev. Dr. James H. Ryan, Dr. John F. Moran, and Dr. Jerome F. Crowley. We are in a very special manner indebted to the Rev. Dr. William J. Kerby, of the Catholic University of America, and to Dr. Frederick W. Rice, of New York City.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

CHAPTER I

CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES AND TEACHING 5

CHAPTER II

THE VOICE OF CONSCIENCE 9

CHAPTER III

THE MARITAL RELATIONSHIP 13

CHAPTER IV

THE HOME CIRCLE 24

CHAPTER V

OVERPOPULATION 32

CHAPTER VI

UNDERPOPULATION 47

CHAPTER VII

WAR, POVERTY, AND INFANT MORTALITY 55

CHAPTER VIII

ECONOMIC AND HEALTH MOTIVES 65

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION 77

BIBLIOGRAPHY 85

NOTES AND REFERENCES 92

BIRTH CONTROL

CHAPTER I

Catholic Principles and Teaching

Marriage has a threefold purpose. First and primarily, its purpose is the begetting and rearing of children. Secondly, it fosters conjugal love and mutual helpfulness between man and wife. Thirdly, it allays the dangers of incontinence.

Purpose of Marriage

Promiscuous or free love relations might conceivably maintain the existence or being of the race, but its wellbeing would, under such a régime, suffer beyond description. Marriage makes for the maximum wellbeing of the race by providing maximum and permanent care by both parents in the upbringing of children; it ensures the maximum protection of the mother by the father; it pins down responsibility on the father by determining clearly who the true father is.

Marriage and parenthood are sacred. Parents are in no figurative sense but literally the agents and representatives of God in rearing children to be worthwhile citizens of the commonwealth of man and the commonwealth of God. Their task is to train up souls for this life and for the next. Their mission is a trusteeship than which none is more exalted and sublime. The vocation of a father and of a mother is a sacrosanct and holy one, so sacred that Christ saw fit to re-consecrate marriage by raising it to the dignity of a sacrament. The Catholic Church extols virginity as holy, for those who can take it. She likewise honors parenthood as holy and sacred. And she holds aloft both ideals in her reverence for and devotion to Mary, Virgin and Mother.

Time and again, in the history of Christianity, heretical groups have maintained that marriage is unlawful, and that the exercise of marital relations and the begetting of children thereby is sinful. The Church has consistently condemned in the strongest terms this suicidal position. Sexual intercourse within the marriage union is the means divinely established for the propagation of the race. But such intercourse outside the marriage union strikes a deadly blow at all three values that marriage protects and that promiscuous mating would utterly blast. For extra-marital intercourse tends to bring children into the world without proper provision for permanent and maximum care of offspring, without proper protection of motherhood, and without definite determination of paternity and paternal responsibility.[1] *

Within, however, the marital union, intercourse is not only lawful. It is divinely planned and sanctioned. The vague feeling sometimes met with that even within the marriage union such relations are indecent, or little short of sinful, or only reluctantly tolerated by morality, is an outgrowth of various causes. This feeling is in no sense an outgrowth of Catholic teaching, and it can find no shadow of support therein.

Marital Rights and Obligations

Not only is the marital relation within the marriage union lawful, but it is of the nature of a strict right. In the marriage contract, by which man and woman take each other for wedded mates until death do them part, they mutually confer on each other the right to marital relations. The two parties enter into the agreement freely and the mutual right is conferred on an absolutely equal plane. The contract is between equals and binds each and both with democratic equality.

Such being the marriage agreement, the refusal on the part of either party to grant the marital right constitutes a breach of

*Numbers denote references and notes listed in order after bibliography on last pages of pamphlet.

contract, an injustice, provided, of course, there be no serious or grave reason for the refusal. Such a grave reason would be, for instance, uncondoned adultery on the part of the requesting husband or wife, the state of insanity or intoxication, grave danger to life or health of mate or of offspring from contagion, serious illness, or extraordinary suffering and peril in childbirth. And there may be other grave exempting grounds.

Husband and wife may, however, by mutual consent, forego the exercise of their marital rights, whether for a time or even permanently, if moral and other danger is absent. They are not strictly obliged to exercise the right at any particular time, and, if they both elect to abstain during certain days of the month, as, for example, the mid-menstrual period,[2] they are free to do so. Such abstention on the one hand places no unnatural obstacle in the way of procreation, and in the main is not open to the gravely harmful consequences that follow the use of direct contraceptive measures, and on the other hand may be fairly looked upon as a corollary of the general liberty to abstain by mutual consent when the parties so choose.

Limitation of Offspring

The Catholic position on the limitation of offspring is frequently misinterpreted by non-Catholics and sometimes misunderstood by Catholics themselves. It does not hold that married couples are under obligation to bring into the world the maximum number of children, to exercise no foresight or prudence, to bear offspring up to the limit of physiological fertility, to labor for the maximum increase of the population, to bring on "an avalanche of babies"—all regardless alike of circumstances and consequences. It holds no brief for imprudence or intemperance. It does emphatically stand for marital chastity against artificial prevention of conception.

The question is not primarily, Is it ethical to limit the number of offspring? but rather, What method is ethically justified in the accomplishment of this end, the method of abstinence and continence, or the method of artificial prevention? The two

questions open up profoundly different ethical issues. If a married couple elect to practise continence and thus limit the number of offspring, they will not be infringing on Catholic principles. Such limitation by continence may at times be distinctly to be advised, as, for instance, when the mother's health or life would be seriously jeopardized by further childbearing, or when real destitution may result from further additions to the family.

But limitation of offspring by artificial prevention of conception is of its very nature immoral, and immoral means are not justified by ends however good. Having marital relations while at the same time using physiological, mechanical, or other means to prevent conception is, in accordance with Catholic ethics, ever and always immoral, sinful, and grievously sinful.

This attitude on the part of the Catholic Church is not a mere matter of ecclesiastical legislation, as are, for instance, such laws as those of fasting during Lent or of abstaining from meat on Fridays. She has no power to dispense in the premises. Her standard is not merely a matter of Church law. It is a matter of divine law over which the Church has no authority except the authority of promulgating it and of standing by it, come what may. Artificial prevention of conception is ever and always gravely sinful, just as adultery is.[3]

Such is the historic stand of the Catholic conscience. What are the ethical grounds therefor? It is to the consideration of the more important of these grounds that we may now address ourselves.

CHAPTER II

The Voice of Conscience

There is a widespread if not universal shrinking from and repulsion towards artificial tampering with the functions of procreation. Unsophisticated mankind more generally looks upon contraceptive methods as unnatural, unclean, immoral. Most simple peoples on the lower cultural levels are little addicted to such practices, even peoples who do not scruple much at abortion and infanticide. Among peoples on the higher civilized levels of material culture, individuals or groups may reason themselves into an ethical defence of such methods and may acquire a certain relative callousness in practising them, but even they do not always succeed in entirely quenching the disgust and repugnance that the personal use of contraceptive measures commonly arouses in refined and high-principled natures.

Validity of Ethical Intuitions

The dictates of unsophisticated conscience in the field of sex are not, it is true, necessarily the last word in morality. They are not necessarily infallible. But, on the other hand, to brush them aside lightly as superstitious inheritances from a dark and ignorant past is perilously foolhardy. "To disregard instinctive [?] repugnances in matters of sex-morality is exceedingly dangerous, and would lead logically to the toleration of acts which all decent persons condemn."[4] What of the disgust at and condemnation of unnatural and solitary vice? And what of the seemingly universal human sense of shame, modesty, reticence, and reserve in sex matters? We may be pardoned for not instancing more lurid examples.

Grounds for Ethical Intuitions Often not Obvious

The real reasons underlying the moral intuitions of sex are not always obvious to the casual observer. How often do we find otherwise intelligent folks overlooking the profound protective value of, for instance, reasonable sex conventions and reasonable sex reticences? Or take a more striking example, the prohibition of near kin marriage. The deep horror at and the draconian prohibition of incestuous sex relations or of incestuous marriage, particularly between parent and offspring and between brother and sister, is practically universal among both uncivilized and civilized peoples. Yet how few individuals, even among educated and highly intelligent Christians, are at all aware of the real reasons that are back of their own social, moral, and religious condemnation of such relations and marriages.

Such condemnation is commonly supposed to rest on an assumed danger of giving birth to degenerate offspring. It does not rest, however, and historically has not rested on such a ground. Recent biological discoveries in heredity, while seemingly discounting to a considerable extent the theories prevalent in the last century regarding direct degeneration of the offspring of near kin unions, nevertheless on account of the hazards of transmission of undesirable latent recessive traits, are very far from lending approval to indiscriminate human inbreeding.[5]

But even were such hazards altogether absent, the Catholic position would be quite unaffected. This position rests on other grounds and has historically so rested. The two more important of these have been: first, the social value of checking family clannishness and exclusiveness and of multiplying social bonds in the community; secondly, and above all, the profound necessity of preserving from taint the sanctuary of the home wherein the members must live day and night under promiscuous conditions that might readily give rise to grave immoralities, were not the severest taboo on sex rigidly enforced within the family

circle. Some of the data from the Freudian psychology have seemingly thrown new light on this second consideration. St. Thomas, by the way, who clearly and explicitly sets forth the foregoing grounds, makes no mention whatever of the danger of degenerate offspring.[6]

We have given space to this apparent digression from our subject to illustrate a vital point, namely, that sex reaches down into unfathomed depths of human nature, that its moral intuitions are fraught with far-reaching, albeit subtle and silent, consequences, and that the moral grounds for the tenets of sex codes are very often far from being so obvious that he who runs may read.

Such is emphatically the case in regard to birth control. The Catholic position thereon certainly does not rest primarily on the widespread attitude of disgust at contraceptive methods as unclean and immoral, yet it would be worse than folly to waive aside such an emotional and ethical reaction as of no moment. The bare fact of the existence of such a social or moral intuition is at its lowest valuation significant, a "stop, look, listen," sign. Is this intuition then morally wholesome and socially sound?

In endeavoring to evaluate this intuition at its moral worth, we shall first give attention to the bearing of artificial birth control upon human welfare or, to use the Catholic ethical term, upon human perfection, leaving to the concluding chapter the consideration of its relation to the eternal and natural law. We shall consider artificial birth control, not from the standpoint of its physical results, nor purely from the standpoint of "unnaturalness" or unnatural use of function, but rather from the standpoint of its consequences for the individual, the family, and the race. So far as the effect of contraceptive measures on the health of those using them is concerned, there is ample evidence regarding frequent possibilities of harm to serve as a pointed warning,[7] but we shall be content to await further data on the question. So far as the "unnaturalness" of contraception is

concerned, we shall deal not so much with this unnaturalness in itself as with the profoundly blasting consequences that result from such "unnatural" use.

The evidence regarding these consequences may for convenience be grouped under three general headings, accordingly as they bear upon (1) the conjugal relationship, (2) the home and its functions, and (3) the race. We shall then discuss briefly some of the chief motives that appear to be responsible for the spread of birth control practices in our modern civilization.

CHAPTER III

The Marital Relationship

The broad domestic relation of man and wife is woven of three intertwining strands, passion, love, and parenthood. We are not speaking exclusively of the marital relation in its strictly physiological sense. We are referring to the whole marital or conjugal relationship within the home.

Three Elements in Marital Relationship

Of passion or the purely physical factor in the marital relation not much need be said. Physical sex pleasure and gratification is not an end in itself. It is biologically a means to an end. It is a sense gratification which nature and nature's Author has attached to procreation to induce mankind to carry on the task of bringing new human beings into the world and thereby to provide for the propagation and continuance of the race. Were it not for this physical appeal, many would shirk the task from selfish considerations. This appeal is primarily to the selfish or self-regarding in human beings in order to induce them to take up the burden and task and responsibility of carrying out an unselfish or other-regarding office. It is shared in common by man and his humbler brethren of earth, and air, and sea.

a. Passion

The second element is of a distinctly higher and more spiritual order, the element of love. Passion and love are often confused. They are, however, two distinct things, and in actuality may often be found one apart from the other, although they usually tend to exist side by side. Love is characterized by

b. Love

mutual attraction and sympathy, the desire for companionship, and tenderness of affection, but there stand out in the higher forms of love two factors that are still more significant socially, the factor of constancy and the factor of self-devotion and self-sacrifice. Love, in the sense of mutual attraction at least, has its early beginnings far down in the scale of sub-human living things. Love in the sense of constancy and self-devotion begins to appear in a rudimentary form, only rather high up in the biological scale, particularly among the birds and some of the higher mammals. Love in its full blossoming of tenderness, constancy, and self-devotion is more truly a strictly human characteristic.

In contrast to physical passion, higher human love is primarily unselfish, devoted to another, and self-sacrificing. It centers its affection, its well-wishing, and its well-doing not upon self so much as upon the object of love, the loved one. If passion is above all egoistic and self-regarding, love is above all altruistic and other-self-regarding.

c. Parenthood

The third element, the parental, covers or connotes several factors, such as the desire for and love, care, and protection of offspring, the acceptance of the responsibilities and sacrifices of child-bearing and child-rearing, and the coöperation in the divine creative act and educative dispensation. Each of the chief factors just noted has profound influence upon the character development of the parents and the atmosphere of the home relation. These factors saturate the marital relation and domestic life with the self-devoted, the sacrificial, the sacred. A word about each of these three factors in the parental element will make the point clear.

The mutual love of husband and wife finds its completion and fulfillment and final consecration in their common love of offspring, and is sustained, fed, and further purified by their common sacrificial and unselfish devotion to and protection and care of their children.

The office of parenthood is full-laden with the highest spirit and requirements of lofty altruism in consequence of its long years of responsibilities and sacrifices for offspring, and the marital sex relation itself carried out normally and honestly is by its open-eyed acceptance of prospective parenthood lifted up out of the purely physical plane into the higher moral and spiritual plane, and self-centered sex gratification becomes surcharged with higher energies of a moral and deeply altruistic order.

And still another element is present in parenthood, the element of the sacred. The divine work of creation was carried out in all its details without man's intervention or coöperation. But the bringing of human souls into existence is, under the order of Providence, left by God subject to the will and coöperation of man himself. Without such coöperation, God Himself creates no human soul. Parents, therefore, have a divinely entrusted and essential responsibility and partnership in the sublimest work of creation, in the bringing into existence of human beings, immortal souls, children of the Father of mankind.

More than this, they are entrusted with an equally sacred responsibility of taking God's own place in the rearing of their children and in molding and shaping their lives that they may be fit for man's society here and for the society of God hereafter. Even those who have abandoned belief in a higher Power feel something of the inner sacredness of honorable human procreation and of parental tasks, and bow in reverence before worthy fatherhood and motherhood.

Passion, love, parenthood—all three go to the making of the domestic and marital relation. But the three are not of equal worth judged by any wholesome human standard. Passion is primarily self-seeking, self-centered, self-regarding, egoistic. It may foster love no doubt; but it may also corrode or crowd out love. Love and parenthood are primarily other-seeking, other-centered, other-regarding, altruistic, and carry with them a subtle atmosphere of the sacred and reverential.

Moreover, the interplay of these three great factors is part of a wondrous strategy by which the selfish sex hungers of humanity are exploited and utilized, not only, as is obvious, for the good of the offspring and for the welfare of the human race, but also for the character-training, the higher development, the higher discipline, and the higher freedom of human mates. Human sex hunger is lured by the bait of sex gratification into providing for the continuance and propagation of the race. But sex pleasure and gratification serve another scarcely less important end, and are capitalized by nature and moral codes through a less obvious strategy. By tying up sex to the sacrifices and responsibilities and reverences of child-bearing and child-rearing in the marriage bond, self-regarding egoistic sex pleasure is built upon and made use of for the drawing out and cultivating and expanding of the unselfish and altruistic tendencies in our human inheritance.

Child-rearing Altruism and Home Sanctities

Conversely, the cultivation of and indulgence in sex gratification in itself and isolated from its natural correctives, unselfish love and devoted and sacred parenthood, stamp in and harden and aggravate man's inborn selfishness and egoism, first of all in the great field of sex itself, and by irradiation in much of the rest of human life and human activities. And few realize how deep-lying and far-reaching sex and parental impulses are. Fatherhood, motherhood, marital and parental love, protection of the weak, filial affection, brotherly love, and, probably, by extension, neighborly love, all arise out of this one cycle.[8] Delete these things from human life, and how little worth while remains. Poison the stream at its source with the poison of selfishness—will these higher things escape the taint?

Finer human nature intuitively condemns solitary vice, unnatural vice, and incontinence between the unmarried. Is not one, perhaps more or less subconscious, source of the intuition

the fact that these moral aberrations isolate passion from love and parenthood? They tend of their nature to deflect the streams of human character and conduct from purer unselfish channels into starkly selfish channels. They strip sex passion of the normal controls and correctives and counterchecks placed upon it by nature and the God of nature and leave it shorn and naked in all its degrading and degraded grossness and unloveliness.

Contraception, Like Extra-marital Incontinence, Fosters Egoism and Desecrates Home Sanctities

Artificial birth control tends likewise to isolate sex passion from its natural controls and correctives, love and parenthood. It reaps the pleasures of sex while at the same time evading the normally consequent sacrifices and responsibilities of sex.

Contraceptive practices eliminate from the marital relation prospective acceptance of parenthood, and only too commonly eliminate parenthood itself from the home or reduce it to near the zero point. The element of the sacred that ordinarily hallows marital intercourse disappears where there is no question of coöperation in the divine creative act nor of acceptance of the sacrosanct office of parenthood. The evasion moreover of parenthood means as well the evasion of the character-building and character-sustaining sacrifices and responsibilities that parenthood entails. Contraceptive practices in eliminating the parental element from the marital relation, tend, in so far as they go, to eliminate from the marital relation the sacredness that elevates sheer sex passion in marriage and at the same time to eliminate from the lives of those who practice them the stimuli to unselfish altruism that offset the stimulus to selfish egoism given by physical sex gratification.

I. By Eliminating the Parental Element

There still remains or may remain love. Will it suffice in the long run and among the great masses of men and women to sustain the higher and finer currents in the marriage institution?

Is love in its higher and finer sense at all universal? And how often do we find it, even in the home, scarcely more than tinged with grosser and more calculating elements!

II. And by Undermining Love

And how often does it descend to a level hardly if at all superior to the level of naked passion! But even were its higher type more nearly universal, would this higher type itself stand intact in the long run?

Love has not "just happened." Love is a growth. It has grown and been bred into life in response to a vital biological need. The biological function of love is not merely to attract the sexes to each other. Love in its higher human sense would have had no great biological purpose unless there had been offspring that needed long-enduring bi-parental care.

Love in its rudimentary form of mere sex attraction as found among lower sub-human sentient forms of life does indeed fulfill only the purpose of attracting the sexes to each other until sex mating takes place. In my study some time ago I had a large Luna moth. She laid her eggs upon my window screen and days before they hatched, she died. The male parent had died even earlier. When the eggs hatched, forth came the tiny green caterpillars, armed for the battle of life, with bodies equipped all over with stiff bristles that would discourage hungry winged enemies and with massive mandibles that would enable their owners to begin at once eating their way through life. Placed on proper living foliage, such as walnut or hickory or sweetgum, where the mother under natural conditions would have deposited her eggs, these newly born Luna infants would have been well able to fend for themselves. They would have eaten and eaten until they attained their full three inches of length.

The mating of the Luna moth demanded only sex attraction. It demanded no higher love, for the offspring required no care. Such rudimentary love as exists in the lower animal scale is mere sex attraction. No self-devotion or constancy is needed, for no prolonged care of offspring is needed.

Higher up in the scale of living things, love with its characters of constancy and self-devotion puts in an appearance. It puts in its appearance in response to the need of care of offspring by both parents for a more or less prolonged period. Such is the case among birds and some mammals, for instance. You may watch such love at work from your window in the mating and nesting and offspring-raising of the familiar robin or English sparrow.

In mankind, the care of offspring necessarily extends over many years, and calls for the closest union and coöperation of parents and the highest spirit of mutual devotion to each other in their common sacrificial task of rearing children. So in the human species, love in its loftiest sense first appears.

Love in the human race meets a profound biological need, the need of bi-parental, self-devoted, and prolonged care of offspring. By what psychic or social forces or process it has been bred in or sustained we are not in a position to determine. But of this we are certain, that love in all its higher manifestations which distinguish it from bare sex attraction is an outgrowth of the parental element, a phenomenon that has been bred into human life and sustained at high tension therein—though none too high at that—by the needs of human infancy and child-rearing.

Eliminate the child from family life or tend so to eliminate him by contraceptive measures widely practised among great masses of humanity, and you thereby impoverish the soil where love grows and dry up the very seed and roots of love itself. No doubt but that the deadly effects will not always make themselves apparent at once in every individual life. They will not come suddenly and dramatically like a bolt from the blue. Love-force will maintain itself, in some measure at least, as a psychic or social inheritance from countless generations of child-bearing and child-rearing ancestors. The process of love-growth in the race was slow. The process of death will likewise be leisurely perhaps. The mills of life, like the mills of the gods, grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small.

It is well, moreover, to remember that love is a comparatively late growth in the biological scale, unlike sex attraction and the mating instinct which date from the lowest and earliest levels of that scale. Love having been bred into life in a much later period and against powerful egoistic forces, all biological and sociological analogy suggests that it can the more easily be bred out of life in large part or in its entirety, if the factor that bred it and sustains it in intensity, namely, child-rearing, is cut down or approaches the vanishing point in large masses of humanity. Higher love is found among many if not most of the lower nomadic hunting tribes. We have no good ground for inferring that it is a later development in human history. But, on the other hand, we have no guarantee that love is something as stable or universal in humanity as is reason, or language, or the parental impulses. In fact, among not a few primitive peoples and among large groups in the more civilized peoples of ancient and modern times, we seem to see very significant and sinister instances where love has actually been eliminated from and bred out of the home relationship.

We are not, of course, reducing ethics to a mere sublimated biology. We are simply dealing with a biological fact, and ethics takes into account data from every field that affects human welfare. Again, we are not assuming the inheritance of acquired characters, nor are we committing ourselves to this or that theory of biological or social development. We know that love has been bred into life where before it did not exist. By what process or genetic mechanism we do not know or pretend to know. But we have every ground for concluding that love can be largely bred out of the life of the race, if the factor that bred it in and sustains it, the factor of child-bearing, weakens or verges on decay. We are concerned not with the *process* by which the factors responsible bred love into the race, but we are concerned solely with the *fact* itself.

We may, for clearness' sake, sum up the foregoing discussion as follows: Three distinct elements go to make up the

marital relationship—passion, love, and parenthood. It is the latter two that lift up and ennoble that relationship, that foster the altruistic impulses, and that consecrate the conjugal union. Contraceptive practices tend to eliminate immediately and in the lives of those who use them, the sacred and sacrificial and self-devoted elements that are part of the parental phase of home life and of marital relations. In addition they tend, if not always and immediately in the individual case, at least in the long run and racially, to eliminate the altruistic elements that are associated with the love phase of home life and marital relations. Eliminate these two sets of correctives and controls and hallowers of home life and marital relations, and you have little left but gross sensuality, naked sex passion, and sex gratification, stripped of all its loftier associations and concomitants.

III. And Thus Reducing the Conjugal Relationship to the Level of Sheer Self-regarding Passion

Contraceptive practices have this in common with solitary and unnatural vice and with incontinence between the unmarried, that they all isolate or tend to isolate sex passion from love and parenthood; that they concentrate or tend to concentrate attention and desire upon selfish sex gratification alone; that they dethrone love and parenthood and enshrine physical self-regarding pleasures in the central and dominating place of personality. May we not then justifiably put them all on the same moral plane, or rather brand them all as of the same order in the moral abyss? Is Bernard Shaw's characterization of contraceptive practices as reciprocal masturbation too brutal? Was St. Augustine using language too strong when he referred to contraception as making a prostitute out of the wife and an adulterer out of the husband? Yet only recently one of America's ablest gynecologists, Dr. Howard Kelly, whose theology no doubt differs considerably from that of St. Augustine, used almost the same words: "All meddling with the sexual relation to secure facultative sterility degrades

the wife to the level of a prostitute." [9] Such language is unquestionably vigorous, to say the least; but, apart from the reflection it implies upon those who may, in good faith and without awareness of the similarities between birth control and other sex aberrations, practice contraceptive measures, can we, in view of the considerations advanced in the foregoing paragraphs, look upon it as mere metaphor?

A Corollary

One further point before we pass on. Let the spring poet continue to pen his lyrics to romantic idyllic love. Thank God, there is much of it in human life. But, on the other hand, we need no deep delving into the psychology of sex and no vast experience of the baser realities of life to know that sex passion in the man only too often masquerades in the domino of love.

Contraception By Hindering Motherhood Dethrones Womanhood

Women, particularly the unmarried, being as a more general rule less drawn by the grosser physical side of sex than by its higher psychic and emotional phases, often do not realize the absorbing and overpowering physical drive that sex so commonly exerts in the masculine life. They do not realize how large physical gratification bulks in the man's sex psyche and how easily the physical side of sex may eclipse and overshadow love. They do not realize that man is apt to be so much more polygamous and inconstant in his impulses. Neither do they realize by what an easy decline love can descend to a purely physical plane and reverence be no more—unless the man see in the woman the mother or prospective mother of his children.

Remove motherhood or prospective motherhood from the home, or tamp it down; do away with the maternal element in the marital relation, and the way is all too often made straight and smooth for the man to look upon his wife as primarily a thing instead of a person, as primarily a mere instrument for satisfying his animal passion, instead of looking upon her as the

honored, revered, and cherished mother of his children. The descent is not from the human to the animal plane. The descent is from the human to the sub-animal plane.

The Catholic Church in taking her stand for normal relations within the marital bond is standing not for some minor ecclesiastical regulation. She takes her stand for the preservation of the inner sanctities of the home life and for the maintenance of all those higher and loftier and nobler sentiments and affections and relationships which distinguish the home from the barnyard or the house of prostitution, and which set a broad barrier between human marriage and the mating of a dog and a slut.

CHAPTER IV

The Home Circle

"Experience in summering and wintering with fathers and mothers makes it evident that adult life, relieved of the fullest care of children, would become so poor and mean as to imperil civilization itself." [10] If we except from this generalization the minority of adults who are by nature and grace exceptionally high-principled and unselfish and strong-willed, would not the sane judgment of most intelligent people agree with this view as expressed by two American workers than whom few have been for longer periods nearer to the lives of the great masses of the people?

a. Home-making and Child-rearing as a Project in Adults' Moral Education

The home is the school of childhood. But it is just as much and just as truly the school of adulthood. It is a school of living experience in which two adult mates, man and woman, are educated—educated out of instinctive egoism and unselfishness, out of the native self-centeredness which is diametrically opposed to the disinterested love that lies at the base of Christian morality, and for that matter at the base of the moral codes of humanity.

Selfishness is proverbially attached to bachelorhood, and has become so attached in the average human mind as a result of observation of the everyday facts of life. As in all things human, exceptions occur. But the trend and the rule remain true. Nor is this due altogether to the probability that marriage may selectively attract the more unselfish. There is another great reason.

Home-making and child-rearing are, to borrow a term from

the educator, a great "project" for the education of adult mates. Sex attraction and love and often desire for children serve as the stimuli or interests that impel adults into wedded life and parenthood. Once they have entered upon that life, its very circumstances and necessities are of a nature to draw out and drive into action the finer self-sacrificing, courageous, and hardier strains of character. These native strains of character more often remain latent and asleep in the unmarried, if indeed they do not pass, as adulthood merges into age, from sleep into coma, and from coma into death. It is the appealing note of an infant's voice and the trusting look in an infant's eyes that awaken them and cause them to leap forth into expression. Like a muscle that long remains unused, they tend to wither and shrink. It is the magic touch of an infant's hand that sets them in action and gives them the exercise without which they tend to vanish out of the average life, and leave that life empty, impoverished, self-centered, and of little moral worth.

The rearing of a good-sized family of children entails two or three decades of unselfish care and active responsibility, of curtailment of liberty and renunciation of pleasure, of ready sacrifices and self-denials of the most altruistic kind. It means hardships courageously faced and borne, moral effort consistently and persistently put forth, responsibilities unflinchingly shouldered, sacrifices unselfishly made. Fathers and mothers are trained not by the feeble words of human exhortation, but by the living experiences of their very parenthood.

Human beings do not normally grow and develop in soul entirely from within. Our moral discipline and development is usually dependent on some situation in which we are placed or in which we place ourselves voluntarily. Only by reason of this stimulus from without do we ordinarily do anything worth while or give of the best that is in us. Lacking this stimulus, we drift, we dawdle, we atrophy. It is in rising to an occasion, in meeting a crisis, in responding under some form of instinctive interest or moral impulsion to a situation and a responsibility in

which we are placed or in which we place ourselves that we grow and develop morally. And for the great masses of humanity, it is the rearing of a normally large family of children that morally disciplines and morally develops adult character.

Conversely, birth control practices, by eliminating or notably reducing child birth and child care, knock from under character the blocks and stays that sustain and support it in the great masses of humanity during the decades of ripe adulthood. Such practices encourage and strengthen the spirit of ignoble ease, of physical indulgence, or gross material enjoyment. They second humanity's inborn bent towards the shirking of responsibility and the shrinking from hardship. They help to stamp in flabbiness of will and languor of spirit. They tend to enfeeble the powers of sustained effort and of hardy endurance, to sap the foundations of morale, of moral stamina and robustness, to train adults in moral mollycoddleism.

Contraception Undercuts This Project

No doubt but there are among those who practise artificial birth control some or many who escape, at least for a while and to a greater or lesser degree, the natural consequences of their practices. This or that man or woman of exceptionally robust moral inheritance may be relatively immune to moral contagion and resistant to moral breakdown, in whatever environment or under whatever influences he or she be placed. But most of us are fashioned from a clay of coarser texture. And an ethics that is concerned with human welfare must mold its principles and obligations not so much on the exceptional individual as on the average humanity which it is commissioned to serve.

Birth control practices engender selfishness and softness in man and wife and in the home which these twain make. We have no reason to believe that such selfishness and softness will be taken off like a smoking jacket or a kimono as man or wife passes out of the precincts of the home into the community. A habit developed in one field of life or enthroned in one corner of

personality may not automatically transfer or spread over into other fields and reign over other provinces of character. The man who is scrupulously honest in his golf score may cheat his business competitor to the queen's taste. We need, however, to remember, not only that the sex and parental fields of life cover an enormous area in themselves, but also that much of the altruism that is at the base of charity and neighborly love and justice is deeply rooted in and sustained by the sex and parental drives in our human make-up.

Instinct, or an inborn force that usually passes for instinct, impels a parent to care for, love, and protect his own children, to resent an injustice to them, and to sympathize with them if they suffer or are in pain. It is no doubt the same parental instinct that impels us to protect and help children in need who are not our own, and it is in all probability the same inborn strain, generally speaking, that naturally inclines us to succor the needy, helpless, or suffering aged person or adult, and that rouses within us moral indignation at injustice or cruelty to the defenceless, be they young or old. The parental impulses are probably the greatest natural source of brotherly love and neighborly justice.[11]

Establish selfishness in the field of sex and parental impulses, as birth control tends to do, and can we doubt that selfishness will in greater or lesser degree contaminate the wider neighborly relations of charity and justice? For the stream is being poisoned at its source. Establish selfishness and softness and calculating shirking at the very heart of the home, and can we question that the same ignoble spirit will carry over to greater or lesser extent into business and friendship and community relations?

Nor will the force of this influence be felt only outside the home circle. It will all the more be felt within the very walls of the home. The one or two children that characterize so commonly the birth control family will be the first to feel this disintegrating and degrading influence in their plastic years, to

say nothing of the reasonable certainty that they will later practise, when they marry, what they have learned from parental example. Children are molded in character less by what they are told at home than by what they with their uncanny keenness feel or see or intuitively sense. The selfishness and softness of parents are by contact and infection inoculated into the very life blood of the child, and selfishness and softness are willed to him to be his portion and inheritance for life.

Furthermore, the one-child régime, so common among those who are given to contraceptive measures, only too often makes for the spoiling of the child. It does not do so always, it is true, for human things do not work out by rule of thumb, but it does so in so many cases, that the lone child has become the proverbial exemplar of selfishness and spoiled possibilities, "unhappy and the cause of much unhappiness to others throughout his or her life." [12]

b. Growing up in a Good-sized Family a Project in Children's Moral Education

On the other hand, a normally large family is, like child-rearing for the parents, a great project in the education of character in the children. Quite apart from parental example and training, an inestimable amount of education, not in book-learning, but in the ways of life and living, is gotten by the children from their democratic group life within the home circle. In a normal family, say, of five to seven children, almost every fundamental type of personality and character will more likely be found that may be found in the larger society of the world. In such a family we have a sort of world in miniature, a micro-society wherein the child learns to live with and adjust himself to his fellow human beings of diverse types and temperaments, and learns it naturally, simply, and efficaciously, and from the cradle up. In this small democratic world of brothers and sisters, he learns self-reliance; he learns generosity and the habit of sharing; he learns the give-and-take of life; he learns self-discipline and self-mastery; he

learns fair play, for he is taught it in brushing shoulders with his peers who, although bound to him by the bond of blood affection, have abundant resources, albeit sometimes rough-and-ready ones, for obliging the recalcitrant to knuckle down to the demands of an elemental and stern justice. Self-reliance, self-control, charity, justice, teamwork—all these primary human qualities are, in a family of fair numbers, bred into the child's life by a vital method that makes our own reasoned-out and tested technic of child training seem almost like a sorry makeshift, and that goes far to compensate for the common educational groping and stumbling and erring of even the more intelligent and conscientious parents in that most complex and difficult of all human tasks, the moral training of children.

The preceding paragraphs may be summed as follows: The rearing of a normal family is an incomparable moral education for the parents;[13] growing up in a normal family is an incomparable moral education for the child; in both cases there is usually no adequate substitute for such moral education; birth control undermines the value and function of the home as an educative project for adults and children. And it undermines this function from within. But it also tends to undermine the home institution from without, and it is to this aspect of the question that we now turn.

c. Children Stabilize the Marriage Union

Children are binding ties between fathers and mothers. More divorces occur between the childless than between those who have children. The more childless marriages we have, the more divorces, other things being equal, may be expected. There are many factors that enter into this situation. It would carry us too far afield to deal with them in detail. But the fact seems well attested even by the statistical and ethnological evidence.[14] Now among couples who practice artificial birth control the number of childless marriages is disproportionately high. In so far then as it goes, the practice and preaching of birth control, not as it might

be on some other planet, but as it actually is on this planet of ours, leads towards instability in the marriage relation and towards a weakening of the home bonds. We do not insist on the point nor do we insist on a somewhat kindred point, namely, that in the one-child or two-child family the death of offspring may leave the parents inconsolable in their latter years and often, too, may leave in its wake a profound maternal melancholia for which there is no balm in Gilead. We do not insist, because the results are exceptional, but nevertheless the point is worthy of consideration.

d. Contraceptive Propaganda and Extra-marital Incontinence

From another viewpoint, the submarining of the home through birth control propaganda is a matter of deeper concern. It is futile to imagine that such propaganda can be so carried on as to reach only the married. In reaching the married, it will reach and is reaching the unmarried as well. One of the great bars that have helped to check immoral relations among the unmarried is the recognized danger of pregnancy. Such a bar has been and is in all probability a most important factor—far more important than appears from our delinquency studies—contributing to the appreciably higher standard of morality among women as compared with the standard among men, for it has been upon the woman much more than upon the man that the stigma and handicaps of unmarried parenthood have pressed most heavily. The spread of contraceptive propaganda and advocacy of contraceptive practices obviously tend to lower the bars that have had such a large part in blocking unmarried incontinence. This means the increase of immorality and a consequent greater harm wrought upon the institution of the home of which extra-marital continence is the basic safeguard.

In the foregoing two chapters we have been concerned with blocking out roughly the main tendencies and general drift of contraceptive practices among average humanity under ordinary circumstances. It is on such wide bases that ethical standards

must be built. The so-called exceptional cases must, however, be taken into account, and this we shall do in the later pages of the present study.

Much, too, of the discussion up to this point has been difficult and perhaps seemingly a little removed from the obvious and superficial. We have had to sink our shafts far down into the depths of human life and character. But, as we stated in the earlier pages of this paper, sex and the parental impulses themselves reach deep down into the lower strata of human conduct. They are not mere surface outcroppings. Modern advances in the biological, psychological, and social sciences are making clearer each year that the sex and parental phases of the human make-up lie deeper therein and affect human welfare for weal or woe more profoundly than does perhaps any other phase of human life. An ethics of sex that neglects to dig far beneath the surface of human life and conduct is foredoomed to failure and inadequacy. And fully ninety-five if not ninety-nine per cent. of the literature of birth control evades this difficult though imperative task.

Having, however, dealt with the less obvious ethical aspects of the birth control problem, we may now pass on to the consideration of its more palpable aspects and, first of all, to the question of birth control and population.

CHAPTER V

Overpopulation

Is the world overpopulated to-day? Will it become overpopulated at some future day? If it should, what will happen? In endeavors to answer these questions, many a quart of ink has been squandered, both before and since the days of Malthus, in riotous writing. Before joining the riot by attempting an answer to these questions, it seems necessary to define as clearly as possible what is meant by overpopulation. Perhaps this can be done best by an illustration.

What Is Overpopulation?

Imagine one hundred people living as hunting folks in an utterly isolated and hemmed-in mountain valley. There is just enough wild game in the valley to supply food for one hundred people. The valley would then be in a state of saturation. Should the one hundred people increase by births to one hundred and twenty-five, we should have an example of overpopulation, for there would not be enough food to supply the requirements of all.

Let us suppose, however, that our isolated hunting group break through their mountain barriers and establish trading relations with a neighboring fertile agricultural region. By exchanging surplus pelts for food, they become food importers. Pressure of population on the soil is thus released, and overpopulation ceases.

Again the numbers increase from one hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty. But owing to insuperable difficulties in transporting sufficient food over the mountain passes and to a deficiency of surplus pelts for trading purposes, enough food for only one hundred people can be imported. Here we

should have overpopulation again, unless fifty of the people were willing to emigrate from their home valley into other parts.

Finally, however, our hunting people, taking their cue from their more advanced neighbors, take to herding and agriculture, that is, develop higher skill in exploiting their natural resources, and so increase their food production that they are able to supply sufficient food from their own valley for five hundred people. Later still, by inventing or adopting better methods of herding and crop-raising, they are able to produce enough food for one thousand people. Pressure is thus released, the birth rate increases, and soon eight hundred people living in the valley are better supplied with food and farther removed from overpopulation than were their earlier one hundred hunting ancestors.

Overpopulation is, in fact, a relative condition. It does not depend on numbers or density alone in a given area. Opportunities for emigration, resources and facilities for food-importation, and varying degrees of skill in food-production must all be weighed carefully before it is possible to say that a given area is overpopulated, saturated, or underpopulated. So far as world overpopulation is concerned, our task is much simplified by the fact that emigration and food-importation do not enter into the discussion.

Is the World Overpopulated To-day?

Is the world overpopulated to-day? Or, to use the common expression, is population pressing upon the soil? The human race has increased with unwonted rapidity in the last century or two, having doubled during the last one hundred years according to many estimates, or having increased about two-thirds since the middle of the eighteenth century according to the recent studies made by Willcox.[15] Our world is, of course, limited in area. Consequently nature's resources, however bountiful, are not boundless. Are there already at nature's table more mouths than plates, more guests than seats? Has population outstripped the available food supply?

That in this or that corner of the inhabited globe, in certain sections, for instance, of India or China or even Europe, there may and does exist overpopulation or at least saturation, no one need question, although misrule and backward agricultural methods are generally more to blame than nature.[16] That, however, the world's resources are, under actual conditions of food-producing skill, sufficient to support comfortably not only our present population of 1,700 millions, but a much larger one, is a proposition to which few if any agricultural experts or economists of standing would to-day take exception. And so far as our own country is concerned, there is equally general agreement that our food resources, actual and potential, are much in excess of our population.

There is not a shred of scientific evidence that the resources of either the United States in particular or of the world in general are insufficient to support the present population. There is abundant scientific evidence to the contrary. Although the world's population has in recent decades been increasing at a rapid rate, the world's food production has been increasing at a still more rapid rate.

Between 1895 and 1912, for example, the increase in the world's crop of wheat was 45%, of corn 43%, of oats 52.4%, of barley 59.2%, and of rye 29.5%, while the world's population during this period increased only 12.6%. Between 1900 and 1911, the rice crop jumped 91.2%, while the population increased only 8.8%. More recent data summarized by Pearl carry the computation up to 1918 inclusive and show the same trend of the means of subsistence to increase faster than the population until 1916, when, as was to be expected, there was a drop owing to the upsetting conditions of the war and to unfavorable seasons.[17]

There is an impression in the minds of many that the means of subsistence are less abundant now than they were formerly. The facts, however, even after we allow for a certain element of minor error in the crop and population estimates of the last de-

cades, flatly contradict such an impression. This impression has probably been caused chiefly by the higher cost of living. But the higher cost of living is not primarily due to any supposed decrease in the world's food products. In the main, as Russell Smith has put it, "the high prices at which we grumble are due not to scarcity of resource but to the stupidity and knavery that persists in a system of food distribution that should have been left behind when Noah went into the Ark." [18]

There is no evidence of general overpopulation to-day in the sense of lack of food products to feed the world's millions. Our best economists and agricultural experts are practically agreed on this fact, and their views are based on concrete and detailed evidence.[19] The rapid growth of population during recent decades has not nearly kept pace with the increase in production.

Is There Danger of Future Overpopulation?

If, however, there is no pressure upon the food and other material resources of the world to-day, do the prospects for the future appear equally satisfactory? We have a number of recent scientific studies bearing upon this question. We shall now give the results of these studies, first, for the United States, and, secondly, for the world at large.

a. In the United States?

For the United States, we have the recent papers of Taylor and of Pearl and Reed, and especially those of East and of the Agricultural Department experts, Baker and Strong. All agree that the United States has actual and potential food resources far in excess of the needs of the present population, although, of course, as is to be expected in such an intricate subject, their precise estimates of the surplus resources differ in detail.

Our population, according to the 1920 census, was about 105 millions. Taylor, in his somewhat theoretic though elaborate survey, hazards the estimate of 513 millions as the maximum potential population of the continental United States. Pearl

and Reed deal explicitly with the ultimate limit at which population will stop increasing and only implicitly with the ultimate limit supportable. Basing their conclusions on the rate of growth since 1790, they calculate that our population will become stationary or nearly so about a century hence at 197 millions.[20]

East's and Baker's estimates are derived from data of a more concrete and less hypothetical nature. East arrives at the conclusion that "the maximum population the United States can support under any conditions conceivable to those of us who live at the present day, therefore, is 331 millions," and that "the ultimate limit humanly possible" is 530 millions, although he considers this latter number as "wholly absurd" so far as the possibility or probability of actual future realization is concerned.[21]

Baker's more recent survey of the field in 1922, published at the beginning of the present year, is a revision and elaboration of the earlier paper published by him and Strong in 1919. In Baker's later paper, he takes into account a number of factors omitted by East, arriving at the tentative conclusion that "our arable land, present and potential, if fertilized and cultivated like the land of Germany, could provide food and fibers in accordance with our present tastes for about 250 million people, and with a largely vegetarian and dairy diet for from 400 to 500 millions, so long as the supply of fertilizer held out." [22]

In 1919-1920, there were in the United States, according to Baker, 503 millions of acres of improved land in crops and pasture. He estimates that there are about 300 million more acres that could be brought into use by draining, irrigation, clearing, and partial utilization for crops of the upland pastures of the East and dry-land pastures of the West. By ceasing, in addition, to export agricultural products, by using improved pastures for crops, and by securing increased yields per acre through more intensive cultivation, we could support on our products about 250 or 275 millions of people, without any material change in our present diet. Such a change of diet, however, in the

direction of substituting dairy products and various vegetable proteins and oils for two-thirds or more of our present meat consumption, would enable the country to support almost double its population. Perhaps a change of the kind is already under way. Our beef consumption to-day is only three-quarters as great as it was fifteen years ago. Nor would such a change do any injury to our welfare. Most physicians seemingly hold that we eat too much meat. At any rate, we consume an enormously large amount, about one hundred and seventy pounds per capita a year, as compared with four pounds in Japan, and with one hundred pounds in Germany before the war.[23]

Some of the elements in Baker's computation are undoubtedly open to question. He himself in fact calls it "a long flight into the realm of statistical fancy." But even though we make all allowances for error in computation, we in the United States are obviously very far removed in time from starvation's door. And Baker is, moreover, not here considering the possibilities of further supplies of food products through fuller exploitation of fisheries, elimination of waste, increase of imports, and other means.

If we may at all confidently predict our future increase of population by our population curve of the past, we shall be well below the 200 million mark in 2000 A. D.[24] Pressure of population on the soil does not exist in the United States to-day. It is not likely to occur for a long, long time to come, if we devote ourselves to the productive arts of peace instead of to the destructive arts of war.

b. In the World?

What is the situation in and forecast for the world at large? Baker in the same article estimates that of the total land area of 52,000,000 square miles in the temperate, tropical, and sub-tropical zones, probably 10,000,000 are ultimately arable. Of these ten million square miles, about 5,800,000 are to-day cultivated or in pasture, and 4,200,000 are potentially available for cultivation or pasture. The Australian statistician, Knibbs, cites data

from the International Institute of Agriculture to the effect that, out of a total land surface of 6042.5 million hectares, nearly one-half the total land surface of the world, for which records are available, embracing Europe, America, a part of Asia, of Africa, and of South America, Australia, and Oceania, 31.19% is classed as productive, 17.13% as unproductive, and 51.68% as unspecified. As he adds, "it is evident from this that there can be a considerable development of population even with existing standards of living."

Immense areas of the world now unexploited or but crudely exploited are capable of supporting an immensely larger number of people than are being supported therein or therefrom today. "Although there is in Siberia a vast expanse of undeveloped arable land, probably as great in amount as the total arable land in the United States, both improved and unimproved; and although there are considerable areas of fertile land as yet undeveloped in Argentina, Australia, and other countries of temperate climate, nevertheless, the great reservoir of unutilized agricultural resources is to be found in the tropics. Tropical and sub-tropical countries include approximately half of the arable land, present and potential, of the world. Of the arable land in these countries, less than one-fourth . . . is in cultivation at present, and possibly one-eighth is used for pasture. . . . Apparently the tropics and sub-tropics include about three times as large an area of potentially arable land as that which remains undeveloped in the temperate zones." [25]

Nor is this all in the way of future resources. A vast amount of rocky, hilly, or mountainous land, now considered as unproductive because unsuitable for cereal or vegetable crops, is well adapted to the growth of nut-bearing and fruit-bearing trees yielding abundant and nutritious food. Again, we have perhaps scarcely begun to tap the world's sea food resources. The total estimated arable land of the world is only about one-fifteenth as extensive as the area of the seven seas. Three-quarters of the earth's surface, or 150,000,000 square miles, are covered with

water. Sea food may not and does not at present constitute a great percentage of the world's food, but does this mean that it must ever be so? The two foregoing means of increasing the world's food resources are dealt with in detail by Russell Smith in a recent work, and he calls attention to great possibilities along other lines, such as scientific improvement, greater use of fertilizers and of mechanical power, the domestication of new plants, and better animal breeding. Smith may, it is true, be carried away in places by his enthusiasm, but his close adherence in the main to concrete facts is fair warrant for the fundamental validity of his forecasts.[26]

The available evidence makes it obvious that the actual and potential food resources of the world can support a far greater population than is being supported to-day. Apart even from any simplification in our manner of life and from the elimination of many comforts and luxuries or near-luxuries that we have come to look upon as necessities, there is room for an immensely greater population than the world supports to-day, and there will be room for generations to come.

To venture to express more precisely the number of generations or years the population can continue to increase, at its present rate, before the pressure of population upon the soil will be felt the world over, is to take an excursion into dreamland. It all depends. In fact, it depends on so many variable and unpredictable things that a forecast expressed in exact numbers is little more than guesswork.

Following are some of the guesses. Leroy-Beaulieu believes that the population of the world could double or triple without overpopulation if properly distributed, while Devas suggests a much larger figure. Marshall thinks that pressure "may be held in check for about two hundred years, but not longer." Knibbs considers that "the more acute problem of food supplies will not occur for a century." East concluded that world-saturation "is not so far distant, but that some of our grandchildren would live to see it," and that the maximum world-population supportable is

about 5,000 millions. Pearl estimates that world-saturation is "at most a few centuries ahead." Taylor offers the figure of about two hundred years. And so the estimates run. Baker, Hoffman, and Smith are content to abstain from precise numerical forecasts, while Willcox is, if anything, still more skeptical and non-committal.[27]

Many of our estimates, however, do not make allowance for one very important factor, that is, the actual probable rate of increase, or else are based on a calculation at the present rate of annual increase of population.

An Important Consideration: The Probable Future Rate of Population Increase

The present population of the world is probably about 1,700,000,000. For the five years ending in 1911, the world population increased, according to Knibbs' estimate, at the rate of about 1.16% per year. He calculates that at the rate of 1% increase per year, the present population would be in 200 years more than 12 billion, in 300 years more than 33 billion, in 400 years more than 90 billion, and in 500 years more than 246 billion.[28] It would be easy enough to show by these figures or by a continuation of the calculation for, say, the next thousand years that the present population could not go on increasing indefinitely *at the present rate of increase*. This is all very interesting, but from the practical standpoint it does not mean much.

The present rate of increase of about 1% per annum is quite exceptional in the world's history. A uniform increase of 1% per annum continued for 2,066 1/3 years would, from a single couple, people the earth to its present population of 1,700 millions. But the race is many times older than 2,066 years.[29] Evidently 1% per annum increase is exceptional. England and Wales increased in population from about 5 to 6 millions, or only 20%, between 1600 and 1700 A. D., from about 6 to 8.9 millions, or less than 50%, between 1700 and 1800, and from 8.9 to more than 32 millions, or from 270% to 280%, between

1800 and 1900. Rossiter concludes tentatively that the European population increased about one-third per century on the average from 1000 A. D. to 1815 A. D., reaching about one-third in the seventeenth century and one-half by the eighteenth.[30] Many parts of the eastern and western world have probably maintained a practically or nearly stationary population for centuries. Such was seemingly the case over much of Europe during a large part of the Middle Ages. Increase in population is not inevitable. It is probably not even normal in human history. It is seemingly abnormal, exceptional, sporadic.[31]

The remarkable modern increase in population has been made possible chiefly by such things as the invention of labor-saving farm machinery, by the development of facilities of rapid transportation on land and sea, and by the bringing under cultivation of great areas of hitherto unimproved lands. These things have vastly and rapidly expanded the available food supply, and population has almost but not quite as vastly and rapidly expanded accordingly. Increased food supplies have meant more marriages and earlier marriages and hence more children for great sections of the people in western civilization, even apart from the greater ease of emigration to new and underpopulated lands.

If Overpopulation Should in the Future Threaten or Supervene, What Would Happen?

That, if the present *abnormally* high rate of increase should continue, population may at some far future day catch up with the available food supply, is not improbable. Granting this, but remembering the all-important *if*, what may we expect to happen?

Some of our alarmists have drawn lurid pictures of the future day when the earth will no longer be able to support her teeming billions, when the "grisly servitors of Azrael," pestilence and war and famine, will stalk abroad among the children of men, when brother will be arrayed against brother, and people against people, in a bloody and desperate life-and-death struggle

for bread. The vision is a distressing one, but those who have painted it in such vivid colors would have been saved their pigments and their distress had they taken account of the evidence that ethnology and economic history offer us.

Overpopulation, saturation, and underpopulation are, as we have seen, relative things. They depend not on sheer density of population, but on the relation between density of population on the one hand and natural resources and the state of the food-producing arts on the other. Many if not most isolated uncivilized peoples living to-day under conditions of sparse settlement of the land are in the state of saturation. No doubt many a time did our nomadic paleolithic ancestors of the caves and river drifts press on the thinly populated soil. There was such local pressure, to cite a nearer example from Biblical times, when Abraham and Lot decided to go their separate ways because the land was not large enough for their flocks and tribes. To give just one more example, throughout much if not most of the medieval period in Europe there obtained a condition of saturation, a condition that persists even to the present day in many a rural section of Europe.[32] Any reader who wishes to consult the evidence to show that saturation and pressure on the soil have apparently been normal in prehistoric and historic times, will find it given in detail in Carr-Saunders' recent study of the population problem.

And what has happened under such conditions of saturation or pressure upon the soil? Many things. Under primitive uncivilized conditions, abortion, infanticide, high infant mortality, and customary or religious abstention from marital intercourse during the nursing and other long periods have helped to relieve the tension of population.

During medieval times, Christian teaching ethically barred abortion and infanticide which among so many non-Christian peoples had been and are socially recognized methods of releasing economic pressure, but the same end was obtained through other means. The great masses of the people of medieval Eu-

rope postponed marriage and a large number from among the economically handicapped classes remained celibate. Of the latter number, many found refuge, as well as consecration to God and service to the race, in the clerical and monastic life, for the step from economic to religious celibacy was a comparatively short one. Overpopulation was averted, and averted without either the corroding practices of artificial birth control or the frenzied death-struggle of starving men. War, famine, and pestilence there were, no doubt, enough of them and to spare, but overpopulation was, so far as we can judge, a minor factor in their genesis and growth; while contraceptive practices among the married were apparently not common.

From our knowledge of what has happened in past centuries when population has pressed upon the soil, we can forecast with some confidence what may be expected to happen in the future, should our successors on earth ever be faced at some distant day with overpopulation or saturation on a world-wide scale. Long before the stage shall have been reached when men will have to tighten their belts to allay the pangs of gnawing hunger or will be driven in desperation into the imagined hand-to-hand struggle for bread crusts, the situation will have been averted by less dramatic measures. The solution certainly can come and probably will come quietly, unobtrusively, efficaciously, mayhap unconsciously, without elaborate foreplanning and "without observation," unless we deliberately choose for other reasons to resort to ancient barbarities to untie the knot. Nor need humanity choose the plausible but fatal solution held out by the beckoning sirens of contraception. Artificial birth control carried out on a worldwide scale would undoubtedly avert overpopulation, but it would solve the problem in the same manner that beheading solves the problem of toothaches. Of this, more later.

Nor again need we appeal to any supposed law of nature that diminishes human fecundity in proportion as civilization advances or urban living increases. Does such a law exist? Maybe. But anything like adequate scientific evidence of its

existence or operation is lacking.[33] Fewer children are born as urbanization progresses, but that the cause of the lower urban birth rate is chiefly or notably a decrease in physiological fecundity remains to be proven.

Should overpopulation ever threaten at some far future day, it can and may be averted by measures that are at the same time social and ethical as well as efficacious, measures that have availed in the past and that avail in many sections of Christendom to-day.

The first measure is the deferment of marriage, particularly on the part of the woman. The later the age of marriage, the shorter is the child-bearing period of the woman, and the fewer the offspring. Moreover, the later the age of marriage, at least after about eighteen to twenty-five years, the less the fecundity. Körösi's study of the data from various European surveys gives the following results: The chances of a married woman having a child in any given twelve-month are nearly one to two if her age be between fifteen and twenty-four, about one to three if between twenty-five and thirty-four, about one to four if between thirty-five and thirty-nine, and about one to ten if between forty and forty-four. Fairly similar results have been obtained by other investigators, as by Dunlop and Lewis for Scotland and Knibbs for Australia. The age of the husband may have some bearing on fertility, but seemingly much less than the age of the wife. Regarding the husband, much more light is needed, as the results of Knibbs' study of Australia and Körösi's of Budapest differ considerably.[34]

a. Deferment of Marriage

From the foregoing data, we may conclude that women marrying, for instance, at the age of twenty-seven, may be expected, roughly speaking, and barring sterility from atrophy, to bear four less children than if they had married at eighteen, one more than if they had waited until thirty, and two more than if they had deferred marriage until thirty-three or thirty-four.

The second measure available, should overpopulation ever in the future become imminent, is that of continence, whether within or without the marriage union. Its efficacy is obvious. Its possibility, humanly speaking, is sometimes questioned. But as a matter of fact, such continence, either marital or extramarital, has been common in both primitive and advanced culture. What has been possible will be again possible, should the need ever arise. Of this more will be said towards the end of the present pamphlet. Another consideration now calls for some notice.

b. Continence

It is commonly believed that the deferment of the age of marriage and the lowering of the marriage rate in any community lead to grave sex immoralities. That they *may* so lead, no one questions. That they *must* so lead, may be flatly denied. Whether they *will* actually do so or not, depends.

As a matter of fact, such checks on overpopulation have been in operation throughout most of human history. He would be a bold historian or ethnologist who would venture to set forth any exact or approximate correlation between the age of marriage, the marriage rate, and sex morality. In medieval times, the marriage age was higher and the marriage rate apparently lower than they are to-day, yet any of us who might be inclined to extol our actual modern sex-moral conditions at the expense of the medieval, notwithstanding a greater frankness or coarseness in medieval times, would do well first to look up some of the twentieth century vice surveys, as, for instance, the New York, Chicago, or Baltimore reports, or Flexner's study of European conditions. Most primitive peoples marry young, and among most primitive tribes nearly all adults marry, yet the sex standards and sex practices of these peoples in the majority of cases are greatly inferior to our own. We have data for scores of tribes whose members marry early and marry almost without exception, and who nevertheless practise premarital and marital laxnesses that are appalling. Among the tribes where very

early marriage prevails, say, about thirteen years for the girls and fifteen or sixteen for the man, some tribes have very high standards of chastity, other tribes very low standards.[35]

The age and rate of marriage are, no doubt, a factor in the total sex morality of humanity, but they are very far from being the determinant factor, nor need they be even an important one.[36] The potential anti-social influence of a high marriage age and a low marriage rate can be counteracted by many other influences. Among such influences stands out the factor of high sex ideals, bred in by careful moral and religious training, backed up by strong social convictions, and buttressed by uncompromising public opinion. Should overpopulation come upon humanity, we should have to give more attention than we are giving to the training of such self-control and self-discipline, and should have to show less tolerance of and leniency towards the abominable double standard. Overpopulation or no overpopulation, a little more intensive labor along these two lines would not be a work of supererogation even to-day in our time of plenty.

In the foregoing pages on population we have reviewed cursorily the evidence showing that overpopulation does not exist on any worldwide or America-wide scale, and that so far as the evidence goes we have no need to worry about the future for a long time to come at the very least. We then entered upon the very hypothetical question of whether such overpopulation will ever come and what we should have to do if it should come. We now leave the shadowy realm of possible far future overpopulation and come back again to the world of realities.

CHAPTER VI

Underpopulation

The future we are actually facing to-day is not a future of overpopulation, but a future of underpopulation. This forecast is based not on a foundation of ifs, but on a foundation of simple, abundant, and obvious biological and sociological facts.

To sustain the existing population without any increase whatever, to maintain merely a stationary number in any given community, it is necessary under our modern conditions that each married woman bear about four children. Sprague's detailed computation gives a minimum of 3.7, Dublin's "close to four," the Whethams' computation "about four," and Thompson's 3.5 to 4. Of any given number of children born, many will die in early infancy or before the marriageable age, and many do not marry at all or not until after the reproductive stage, while a considerable proportion of marriages are physiologically sterile. An average of about four children per married couple is needed if the stock is merely to maintain itself without decrease.[37]

Average Number of Children Required Per Marriage to Keep Population Stationary

Are those couples or those groups or classes who practise contraceptive measures bringing into the world an average of four children? Our various surveys and studies of actual conditions make it abundantly clear that couples who practise artificial birth control fall, as a rule, anywhere from 25% to 75% or 100% short of reproducing even the required four children. Birth control families average closer to two than to four. More-

Birth Control Families Fall Short

over, inasmuch as our statistical data point towards a fertility record that has consistently and steadily fallen during the last few decades, we have no reason to think that even the present-day two-child régime is not going to be reduced down to a still lower average. The number of one-child and childless marriages is increasing, and will, in all human probability, continue to increase for a long time to come.[38]

So far as the United States is concerned, the immigrant groups are in general bearing and rearing more children per family than the native-born, the rural population more than the urban, the western and southern sections more than the northern and northeastern, the less prosperous classes more than the well-to-do and wealthy. The older stocks of most of the Middle Atlantic States and New England are already failing by a large margin to reproduce themselves. From the native-born, urban, eastern, and well-to-do groups artificial limitation of fertility is spreading apace among the foreign-born, rural, western, and less prosperous groups. We have no shred of evidence to reassure us that we in America shall not go the way France is going, and there are some good grounds for thinking, well within the life span of many who are living to-day.[39]

So far as the world in general is concerned, the birth rate is falling in practically every European country, and in some countries at an alarming rate. We again have no shred of evidence to reassure us that the nations of western civilization will not reach the point that France reached a decade ago when her birth rate first fell below her death rate.

Apropos of this steady decline in the birth rate, Willcox has made an interesting computation from the United States census statistics. During the sixty-year period, 1850 to 1910, the proportion of children under five years of age to the number of women of child-bearing age in the United States decreased from 699 to 508, an average of thirty-two per decade. Should this

rate of decrease continue, the proportion would be, in 1950 A. D., 380; in 2000 A. D., 220; and in 2070 A. D., zero! Naturally, neither he nor anyone else predicts that the zero point will ever actually be reached. It is the trend that is significant and sinister.[40]

The Prospect of Racial Decline

Given the required average of about four children per marriage, given the abundantly authenticated fact that groups practising birth control are bearing on the average from 25% to 75% less than this number, with prospects of the average fertility decreasing still further, and given the equally abundant indications that birth control practices are spreading out and down among larger and larger circles in our own country and in most other countries of western civilization, we have before our eyes a patent and obvious exemplification and evidence of what is or comes near to being a sociological law, namely, that the group or nation or civilization that begins to tamper with the conceptive process begins to erase itself from the pages of life and begins to dig its own grave, chisel its own tombstone, and write its own epitaph.

It is theoretically conceivable that artificial birth restriction might be carried out "moderately" and with due regard for race maintenance. But we have to deal not with theoretic possibilities, but with very non-theoretic facts. We are human beings living on this earth, not inhabitants of some distant planet, and human ethics must deal with human beings, not with hypothetical Martians. Theory and hypothesis aside, the rock-ribbed fact remains that human groups who are sucked into the vortex of artificial birth control do not as groups use "moderation" and do not have due regard for racial maintenance. They perish, while those more fit to carry on the torch of life survive.

In the United States to-day and for that matter throughout most of western civilization, the one great massive group standing out for race maintenance is the Catholic body. Except in so far as Catholics may fail in loyalty to their own principles or

ARMY MED

suffer from the infection of their non-Catholic environment, they will show themselves more fit morally because they will stand for an unselfish attitude towards racial welfare, and they will become still more fit morally by the training in unselfishness which their acceptance of parental responsibilities and sacrifices will continue to give them. They will survive.

Our western civilization, should it continue upon the path of artificial birth control which it is so gaily and with such pathetic shortsightedness entering, will find itself in the long run and perhaps in the short run competing hopelessly with the races of the Orient whose religion and culture tie them to a socially far-sighted concept of birth release. When these twain meet, as meet they shall in peaceful competition or in martial encounter, will the outnumbered and shrinking hosts of the West be the more apt to bear off the palm of victory? Those who know the Oriental best are least contemptuous of his character and talents in peace or war and least confident regarding his supposed inferiority to the son of the Occident.

But brushing aside these visions of a far from visionary future Armageddon, let us return to the actual and present.

Birth Control to Date Admittedly Dysgenic

That the effects of contraceptive practices to date have been "dysgenic" or even disastrous, is pretty generally admitted even in contraceptive circles. Over and over again in almost every article or pamphlet or book on birth control written by its advocates, the reader finds the recurrent refrain: The "fit," that is, the prosperous and educated and gifted, are not begetting children to anything like their capacity, while the "unfit," that is, the rest of us, are multiplying apace. And over and over again follows the response to the antiphon: The fit must beget more children, and the unfit must beget less.

That the less prosperous may increasingly beget less children is by no means beyond the range of probability. On the contrary, we may expect the plague of contraception to spread far

more widely than it has spread to date, no matter what laws are written upon our statute books or deleted therefrom. Its results will make themselves felt obviously in our declining population statistics and less obviously but still more disastrously in our declining morale and hardiness and unselfishness, to say nothing of the not improbable darker conflict with the hordes of the Orient.

The Feeble-minded

So far as the notably unfit, in particular the limited number of low-grade feeble-minded, are concerned, a special situation presents itself. We need merely touch upon it summarily here. The feeble-minded tend to have numerous offspring, and feeble-mindedness itself is highly hereditary. On the other hand, feeble-mindedness is a great contributory cause of immorality, criminality, alcoholism, unemployableness, and pauperism. The most humane method of meeting the situation is the one of permanent custodial care in farming colonies or similar institutions, with strict segregation of the sexes. One of the greatest institutions of the kind in the world to-day is the enormous Catholic colony of Ursberg in Bavaria.[41]

That the more prosperous and educated and gifted groups will hearken to the exhortation of the eugenist and contraceptionist to beget their kind to their reasonable capacity, is so improbable that we may safely dismiss the exhortation back to the land of dreams and wishes which gave it birth. "The fit ought to multiply." Yes, they ought. But they don't. And, to use Todd's expression, "no amount of eugenic scolding" is going to get them to do it.[42] Contraceptionists and those eugenists who counsel contraception advocate the inculcation of a high sense of social and national and racial altruism to bring the miracle to pass. But all this is very general and very vague. It is a hope, or the shadow of a hope, a gossamer velleity, and nothing more. The investigator will search in vain in the teeming birth control and eugenic literature for anything like practical, practicable, and concrete ways and means that offer any ray of promise that such a hope and velleity has even a fighting chance of ever being realized.

One final point. Suppose it be granted that quality is more important than quantity in matters of population. A teeming population of morons and criminals would not be a sight for sair een. Two important considerations, however, need to be taken into account.

Quantity and Quality

Quantity may decrease to or to near the vanishing point. Bell wrote recently a very curious and ingenious defence of the thesis that the most widespread imaginable birth control practices would not result in total race extinction, because there would always be a residue of child-desiring adults who would bear and leave offspring as the nucleus of a reviving race.[43] Waiving the many assumptions too numerous to mention here, and speaking from a viewpoint that concerns us and our future as a nation practically, we need only remark that long before any given group or nation shall have reached the lowest stage of underpopulation, it would probably be exterminated or swamped out by hardier contiguous or immigrant groups. Such a process has accounted for the disappearance of many a now extinct uncivilized people in contact with civilized races, and such a process we may see in operation in our own Middle Atlantic States and New England to-day, where more recent arrivals are swamping out the relatively sterile older stock.[44] He who advocates contraception may formulate his own reply to those who prefer that their progeny possess the land of their fathers.

Economic Aspects of Underpopulation

The second consideration is of an economic order. Even granting that quality is worth more than quantity, this is far from granting that quantity is worth nothing. Few economists who agree that there is a law of increasing returns would be willing to make such an admission. Overpopulation may occur. But so, too, may underpopulation, that is, such a dearth of numbers that all suffer and that all receive a lower return for their labor.

There seems to be a widespread impression that getting a living out of nature's resources is like writing checks on a fixed fund deposited in the bank: the more people there are, the more checkbooks, and the less available cash for each checkbook owner. This conception is *un peu simpliste*.

In reality, in any given state of the productive arts and in any given district with its natural resources, a certain density of population up to a certain amount is required, if all the population is to get the best living. If progress in skill is rapid and the natural resources are sufficient, an increase in population is desirable inasmuch as the income per capita will be greater up to a certain point. For one reason, a greater degree of concerted labor makes for a higher productiveness, and sparseness of population makes against concerted labor. If the population decreases too far, again all suffer a decrease of income.

That, for instance, the United States, Canada, and the Argentine Republic have advertised for and helped colonists by land grants and government assistance, is not a policy of tenderhearted philanthropy. Some parts of these countries have been or are urgently in need of a greater population, not only to increase national wealth, but also because "in many localities, covering large areas of the Western World, the population is too sparse to support a good, well-organized, well-financed society with the necessary schools, churches, and other institutions." [45]

It would carry us too far afield to go into minute details regarding the economic questions of concerted labor, the law of increasing returns, and the optimum population. Such details are easily available in standard works on economics.[46] Most of the birth control literature overlooks the economic fact that underpopulation has its perils no less than overpopulation. And of the two future possibilities, to many of us it seems that the concrete facts and trends to-day point to much greater probability of future underpopulation than of future overpopulation.

We may sum up the whole foregoing treatment of population as follows. There is no evidence of real pressure of popula-

tion upon the soil to-day either in this country or in the world in general. Our national and worldwide resources are sufficient to support a population far greater than is being supported to-day. Should overpopulation ever be imminent, it can be successfully averted by efficacious and ethical methods. In reality, we are faced by much more probable and imminent racial decay both in quality and quantity from our ever decreasing birth rate. We are blasting away at the levees. The waters are flooding and devastating wider and wider areas. We are creating a formidable and perhaps a hopeless task for the constructive social and moral engineers of the generations to come. Social and racial blasting is a trade easily learned and easily plied. Constructive social and moral engineering is a task of another stripe.

CHAPTER VII

War, Poverty, and Infant Mortality

The relation of population to war, poverty, and the death rate comes up frequently for discussion in connection with the birth control question. A few words upon this relation, therefore, may not be unnecessary.

So far as war is concerned, it is very difficult indeed to trace, with any precision whatever, what has or has not been the influence of overpopulation upon warfare. Warfare between nations, like warfare between street urchins, may be due to any of a half hundred causes, quite regardless of population or overcrowding. Isolating and evaluating the factor of overpopulation among the numerous other factors that have caused the wars of history, is a task regarding which the scientific historian is inclined to be exceedingly cautious.

a. War

The fact is, overpopulation is, as we have seen, a relative matter, depending not only on density or numbers, but also on the natural resources, the food-getting skill, and the possibilities of importation and of emigration possessed by any group at any given time. True and notable overpopulation in human history has probably been exceptional, while saturation has probably been the rule. The historian will need a more finely ruled yardstick than he has at present even to determine just when and where overpopulation has occurred, let alone to determine its supposed influence upon martial history.

On the other hand, we have abundant evidence of peoples living seemingly at a point of saturation verging on overpopulation,

but who nevertheless are notoriously peaceful. Among civilized peoples may be mentioned, for instance, the Chinese; among the semi-civilized, the Javanese; among the uncivilized, the majority of the agricultural and most of the lower nomad hunting tribes. All of these, and the instances could be easily multiplied, live habitually on terms of peace with their neighbors. Potential overpopulation has been held in check by numerous measures far removed from measure of warlike aggression.

Our best statistical evidence shows that production has far outrun population in western civilization during the last decades. None the less, even the most unmitigated militarist would hardly describe our present days as piping times of peace. The blame for 1914 has sometimes been thrown upon German overpopulation rather than upon militaristic, imperial, and commercial ambitions. The fact is, however, that, in spite of the comparative density of population in Germany, before the Great War there was probably less real poverty among the German people than among any large nation in Europe, from which we have a pretty fair right to conclude that there was little overpopulation or pressure on the soil in any true sense.

About all one can safely say about the relation of population to war is that *if* there be pressure of population on the soil, aggressive warfare *may* result, and then again it may not. Whether it will or not depends on a score of other things. Moreover—and this is the other side of the picture which is usually overlooked and which for us is perhaps the more important—underpopulation may invite warlike aggression on the part of prolific neighbors who happen to be more powerful or think themselves so.[47]

b. Poverty

Passing on to the question of poverty and population, we step at once on to firmer ground. The lack of the necessities of life among any given people at any given period may be due either to overpopulation or to unequal distribution of resources. There may be too many mouths and not enough food

to fill them, or there may be quite enough food to fill all the mouths and yet some mouths are empty while some hands hold more food than needed. There is quite enough of poverty even in our flourishing western civilization, as no one will deny. Is world-poverty or American poverty of to-day due to overpopulation or to unequal distribution of wealth and of the necessities of life?

Poverty Due, Not to Overpopulation, But to Uneven Distribution: i. Food Supply

That it is not due to overpopulation would seem abundantly clear from the simple fact that overpopulation does not obtain to-day on any worldwide scale, while poverty does. As we have seen, food production has very considerably outstripped population during recent decades. There is quite enough food for all, but it is unevenly distributed.

So far as the United States in particular is concerned, we have three other approaches to the same conclusion. According to our most authoritative estimate, the total income of the people of the United States in 1918, if divided equally among all, would average $586 a year per individual, or $2,930 per family of five. Our national income would, if it were at all evenly distributed, amply meet the needs of our population. In 1918, 1% of the income receivers had nearly 14% of the total income in the United States, 5% had nearly 26% of the income, 10% had nearly 35%, and 20% had about 47%.[48]

ii. Income in U. S.

While we are here concerned more with the distribution of income than with the distribution of wealth, the data on the latter are of pertinent interest. One per cent. of the American people own more than 50% of our national wealth, two per cent. of the people own 60% of the wealth, and one-fifth of the people own 90% of the wealth. The distribution of "surplus" income is, like the distribution of wealth, far more unequal than the distribution of income. If

iii. Wealth and Surplus Income

we consider as surplus income all income over $2,000 a year, we find that 2.2% of all income receivers in the United States were, in 1918, getting about 71% of the surplus income, and two-thirds of one per cent. were getting just about 50% of the surplus income.[49]

iv. Wages and Production

Between 1900 and 1919, our products in agriculture, mining, and manufacture in the United States increased about 30% per capita, yet wages, while they increased in gross amount, actually declined in buying power during that period. The workman could buy less for the larger wages he was receiving in 1919 than he could for his smaller wages in 1900. Their real value was less than it was in 1900. There has, it is true, been an increase in purchasing power since 1919, but this increase is comparatively slight and still falls very far short of the per capita increase in productivity. If wage-earners had received a proportionate share of the increased production, real wages should now be about 30% to 40% higher than they were in 1900.[50]

As a matter of fact, the great mass of unskilled workers are receiving insufficient wages to support in frugal decency a family consisting of husband, wife, and three children, and more than 50% of the women in industry are getting less than a living wage.[51] Largely out of such underpayment have been created our great private fortunes, our notably uneven distribution of income and wealth, and much if not most of our poverty.

The causes of poverty and of pauperism are many.[52] Low wages are not the only cause. But from the very brief summary of some of the evidence which we have just given, it is apparent that our contemporary poverty is not to any great extent the result of overpopulation. It is the result of an unequal, an unneighborly, and, to an extent little realized by those not familiar with the wage and profit facts of modern industry, an unjust distribution of products and wealth.

Pauperism is one thing and poverty is another. The great

masses of our unskilled workers are not paupers, but they are suffering from underpayment. They feel the pinch of poverty because they are not receiving a living wage. Our national income is such that a living wage could be paid to our workers and there would still be an ample margin of profit to provide a reasonable return on capital invested and a reasonable remuneration for superior employing ability.

In reality, the elimination of waste alone in industry would provide largely for more equal distribution, apart from the cutting down of profits and dividends. The recent report of Hoover's committee of engineers on waste in industry gives some conception of the enormous annual losses chargeable to our haphazard methods in production, losses totalling billions of dollars annually. In the six major industries studied by the committee, the responsibility of the management for the preventable waste ranged from 50 to 81 per cent. of the total preventable waste, the responsibility of labor from only 9 to 28 per cent. of the total.[53]

Proposal of Birth Control As a Remedy

Advocates of birth control have little to say as a rule regarding the living wage. Some openly oppose it. Many others damn it with faint praise or praise it with faint damns, concluding with some such statement as, "the poor should be counseled to have no family or only small families," or, "the poor should not be allowed to have large families."

Such a loathsomely, even though unconsciously, brutal proposal smells to high heaven. A small minority reap great profits at the expense of the great masses of underpaid unskilled workers. They withhold from the worker a fair return from the profits of industry. Then they say to him: "You have not enough to fill the mouths of many children. You must not have more children," or "You must not have children at all." In other words, we unjustly cheat the worker out of his right to a fair return from his labor, and then we say to him: "You must

forego normal family life." A man's three most fundamental rights are the right to life, the right to family life, and the right to the necessities of life as the fruit of his labor. We unjustly deprive him of the third right, and then, as a remedy, propose to deprive him in addition of his right to normal family life.

Justice the Remedy

The obvious remedy on any ground of ethical justice is first to right the economic wrong we are doing him. Pay him a living wage, and he will be in a position to take advantage of his right to normal family life. The general payment of a living wage, the heart of the Catholic program of social justice, would undoubtedly cut down somewhat the disproportionate returns now accruing to the more prosperous. Such a cutting down of profits would still leave an ample margin or return for the employing and owning groups. It would no doubt mean fewer great fortunes and some simplification in luxurious living. But such a simplification would work hardship on no one. On the contrary, there are few eugenists, economists, or moralists, Catholic or non-Catholic, who would not agree that fewer immense fortunes and more of simpler living would make notably for true individual and collective welfare and be eugenic in the best and highest sense.[54]

The teachings of Malthus and his followers have in the main tended to check movements making for social betterment and juster wages. Poverty, they have more commonly maintained, is chiefly the result of overpopulation; the poor who bring numerous children into the world have only themselves to blame if misery and want follow in the wake of their improvidence; the wealthy who give generously in charity or advocate humane economic reforms and legislation are merely feeding the flames of folly and adding to the sum total of human misery.[55] Many of the modern disciples of Malthus, while often manifesting sincere and heartfelt sympathy for the hard lot of the poor, nevertheless discuss the crucial problems of the living wage and a

more equitable redistribution of wealth either antagonistically, gingerly, or not at all. We are not questioning their motives. Their motives may be and, as we know, often are of the most altruistic and humane kind. We are merely adverting to the objective fact. And the fact remains that the modern neo-Malthusian movement, as a movement, with its emphasis on the contraceptive solution of poverty and its relative silence regarding industrial justice, is shunting attention off the real causes of and remedies for modern poverty and is playing into the hands of those who, having more than their fair share of this world's goods, are interested in maintaining unmodified the present industrial and economic conditions.

Even were artificial birth control ethically defensible, such propaganda is condemnable as a matter of mere policy, because it tends in actuality to block social movements for the living wage and economic justice to the poor. "It is a wiser and better policy," as the National Birth Rate Commission has recently put it, "to suit the conditions and environment to the needs of a family rather than to reduce the number of children in order to fit a defective and injurious state of society." [56] Wholesome family life among the great masses of the people is of infinitely more concern to human welfare than is the accumulation of great fortunes among the few and the multiplication of luxuries and the satisfaction of ever increasing and ever more costly whims and desires.

We may now turn to the relation of the birth rate to the death rate, particularly the death rate among infants. Let us see, first, what are the facts, and, secondly, what is their interpretation.

c. Infant Mortality

That a high infant mortality rate is at times found where a high birth rate obtains is true enough, but the cases to the contrary are so very numerous that the supposed correlation means little or nothing. Sweden, for instance, has a low birth rate and a low infant mortality rate, while its next door neighbor, Norway, has a higher birth rate and a lower in-

fant mortality rate than has Sweden. Connaught has a very high birth rate and an exceptionally low infant mortality rate, while France has a low birth rate and a high infant mortality rate. During the five years that preceded the Great War, the ten departments of France with the lowest birth rate had a higher average infant mortality rate than had the ten departments with the highest birth rates. In New South Wales, the rural class has the highest birth rate and the lowest infant mortality rate. Instances could be multiplied if it were worth while.[57]

Birth Rates and Infant Death Rates

From the abundant statistical material at hand, it would be equally plausible to conclude that a *low* birth rate causes a low infant mortality rate and that a *high* birth rate causes a low infant mortality rate. It would be equally plausible and equally unscientific and wrong. The relation between the two rates is casual, not causal. In the words of the National Birth Rate Commission, "the neo-Malthusian contention that the cause of a high death-rate is a high birth-rate, and that the only way to reduce the death-rate is to reduce the birth-rate, is clearly invalid." [58]

The chief underlying causes of infant mortality are poor heredity, poverty, and ignorance of and lack of facilities for prenatal and natal care. The recent notable reductions in the infant mortality rates of most of the chief civilized countries, including our own, are mainly the result of better prenatal and natal care and instruction. A key measure in the infant and maternal welfare work has been the substitution of breast feeding for artificial feeding. Sweden's low infant mortality to which we referred above is probably due in large measure to the fact that nearly all Swedish mothers nurse their own children. How much farther we shall reduce the infant mortality rate will depend, not on the number of children born per family, but on the amount of money we are willing to

Causes and Remedies

invest in providing instruction and care for mothers and expectant mothers.[59]

Poverty is no doubt an important factor in the infant mortality rate. Our American surveys seem to show a clear correlation between income and infant mortality. Poverty only too often means overcrowded and unsanitary housing, ignorance of hygiene, poor and insufficient nourishment, lack of proper medical and nursing care, all of which make for a higher mortality among the infants of the poor. This is all the more reason that in charity and justice we insist on living wages for the worker and on a more equitable distribution of wealth and income, although, of course, there would still remain the imperative duty of providing adequate health instruction and facilities for medical attention. Even were poverty banished, ignorance and lack of such facilities could easily persist, and the infant morbidity and mortality rate would then still remain high.

Infant Mortality and Large Families

There is a certain amount of statistical evidence apparently pointing to a relatively high infant mortality among unusually large families of nine or ten children or more.[60] Those who, however, draw from these facts the conclusion that large families are themselves the cause of high infant mortality are drawing a conclusion not warranted by the data at hand.

Bell's study, for instance, of 2,964 members of the Hyde family showed that the proportion of children who not only survived but who had the toughness and vitality to survive to ripe old age increased progressively with the size of the family up to nine to twelve children. Only in the rare families of thirteen and more was there an appreciable falling off. Cattell's data regarding the families of American men of science show an inappreciable difference in child mortality between the smaller and larger families, and even this negligible difference is easily accounted for by the fact that the larger families were raised in earlier times when the general death rate of both children and

adults was higher than it is now.[61] In Bell's and Cattell's data, the all-important factors of poverty and neglect are largely eliminated. Even in some of the statistical data on less well-to-do groups, infant mortality is lower among the seventh, eighth, and ninth children than among the fourth, fifth, and sixth.[62]

The foregoing facts show pretty clearly that the real cause of the seemingly higher infant mortality rate among exceptionally large families, particularly of nine or ten or more, is not the size of the family. In fact, to a very considerable degree, infant mortality itself has much to do with the production of large families, inasmuch as the early death of an infant from whatsoever cause makes conception more likely sooner after childbirth.[63] Our statistical studies take little account of the influence of infant mortality upon more frequent conception and a higher birth rate. They do, however, show a striking relation, and a causal relation, between family income and the infant mortality rate.

If there is a high mortality among families who are at the same time poor and prolific, the main cause—though there are others, particularly artificial feeding and birth spacing, of which we shall speak later—is not the size of the family, but the factors we have mentioned on the preceding pages.

CHAPTER VIII

Economic and Health Motives

We have thus far dealt with the Catholic position regarding fertility and the grounds therefor. Some further light is thrown on the whole subject by a study of the causes and motives that actually lead to birth release or birth control.

A thorough systematic enumeration, explanation, and evaluation of all such causes and motives would require many pages and would be a more or less profitless undertaking. Those interested in this phase of the problem can find abundant material in readily accessible sources.[64] Motives of economy and of health figure prominently in questionnaire replies and most discussions of the question. We shall treat each of these two groups of motives briefly.

A. Economic Motives

Economic motives may be of many kinds. The economic motives usually advanced by those who practise contraception are clearly not motives of real want or poverty. The objective evidence is unmistakable. For contraception is least practised where want and poverty is greatest, and is most practised among the classes farthest removed from want and poverty. As a very general rule, the birth rate decreases as income increases. This decrease in the birth rate is due, in some degree, to the slightly later age of marriage and slightly lower marriage rate among the prosperous and educated groups, but the main cause is not the higher marriage age or lower marriage rate, but voluntary birth restriction through continence or contraception.

Among many of the well-to-do, especially among the professional classes, maximum income is not reached until compar-

atively late in life, and so the costs of child-bearing, child-rearing, and higher education mount up until they constitute a certain drain upon family resources. But generally speaking, the economic motives that determine birth restriction, while often tinged with prudence and with desire for family betterment and filial interests, fall in the main much more clearly within the line of timidity, shirking, social climbing, or sheer selfishness. Child-rearing demands parental self-denial, anxieties, sacrifices, and responsibilities, and moreover, in the game of climbing the social ladder, children may become burdensome impedimenta.

Economic birth restriction is more commonly the product of what Leroy-Beaulieu called *"l'esprit arriviste,"* the product of a "neo-paganism" characterized "by the abandonment of high and disinterested ideals, the waxing of egoism, the tense pursuit of pleasure and ease, the contempt of sacrifice, the weakening of the sense of duty. This state of mind finds expression in the familiar formulas: 'the right to happiness,' the desire 'to live one's life.' " [65]

Newsholme has expressed about the same thought in different words. "The desires of mankind become more numerous and varied with each added possession. When these desires lead to interference with family life in persons who are able to meet the normal requirements of a normal family, selfishness may be regarded as having become the chief motive. The increasing rarity of the altruism which welcomes the burden and joy of family life, in those who are well able to bear it, is one of the most unfavorable features of the present day. The ideal of portions of the community, especially of a large proportion of that part of it which has sufficient and abundant means, is one which is almost pagan in its outlook."

Or again, in the words of Crum: "Unless a radical change is soon effected the historian of no far distant period will be compelled to say that the descendants of the colonizers of the United States preferred material luxuries to spiritual realities, lustful conceits to correct theories of life, and selfish gratifica-

tions of inordinate ambitions to unselfish acceptance of the duties of parenthood."

Or finally, as Boas puts it: "We are clearly drifting towards that danger-line where the individual will no longer bear discomfort or pain for the sake of the continuance of the race, and where our emotional life is so strongly repressed by the desire for self-perfection—or by self-indulgence—that the coming generation is sacrificed to the selfishness of the living. The phenomenon that characterized the end of antiquity, when no children were found to take the place of the passing generations, is being repeated." [66]

The language of these leaders in their respective fields of economics, vital statistics, and anthropology—and such statements could be easily multiplied—is no doubt emphatic. No doubt, too, their summing up of motives is sweeping and is open to exceptions in the cases of individuals or small minorities. But in view of the great obvious objective fact that those most evade the responsibilities and sacrifices of adequate parenthood who are best situated economically for bearing them, it would be driveling sentimentalism to draw any other conclusion. On this point, at least, practically all eugenists, Catholic and non-Catholic, are fairly at one.

Next to the economic motive, grounds of health, particularly the health of the mother, come in most prominently for discussion. They deserve and call for careful and sympathetic consideration from all who honor, love, and revere motherhood.

B. The Mother's Health

Three points demand special attention. First, how does the bearing of numerous offspring affect maternal health? Secondly, what is proper spacing between childbirths? Thirdly, what can be done in individual cases where further child-bearing or too frequent child-bearing would seriously jeopardize the health or life of the mother?

How does the bearing of numerous offspring affect the mother's health? Scientific advances in the field of obstetrics

have cut down considerably the risks to health and life involved in child-bearing, but have by no means entirely eliminated these risks. Every mother who brings a child into the world faces a risk, however remote it may be in individual cases. This is one reason why humanity reverences motherhood. Other things being equal, therefore, we may expect a slightly greater mortality among mothers of large families than among mothers of small families.

Maternal Mortality

It is sometimes confidently stated, however, that the bearing of numerous offspring is itself, apart from the above risk, ordinarily followed by loss of health or of life on the part of the mother, and evidence for the statement is derived from mortality statistics. Some of the statistical evidence does indeed show a higher mortality among mothers with large families, but nearly all such evidence is taken from mortality studies made in congested city districts where poverty and all its connotes prevail.

Bell's study of the Hyde family, Jones' study of five New England families, and Cattell's study of American men of science, give quite different results. Among those families, where poverty did not prevail, the mothers who bore the larger number of children were precisely those who lived longer. According to Jones' data, the mothers who lived to the age of from 48 to 62 years had borne an average of about 5.5 children, those who lived from 63 to 82 years about 6 children, those who lived to from 83 to 92 years about 7.5 children. It is only among the rare mothers—nine in all—who survived to the exceptionally advanced age of 93 to 107 years, that there appears a slight falling off in fertility to an average of 7.25 children.

According to Bell's data, the 164 mothers who lived to the age of 40 to 60 years had borne on the average 6.2 children, the 244 mothers who lived to from 60 to 80 years had borne 6.6 children, and the 133 mothers who lived to 80 years or more had borne 7.2 children. Cattell's study of the mothers of American men of science shows a clearly though less markedly greater

longevity among the mothers of from seven to ten children, and especially of the mothers of eleven or twelve children, as compared with the mothers of from four to six children or of from three to one. The 45 mothers who had each borne only one child and who survived their forty-fifth year, lived to the average of 68.6 years, while the 43 mothers who had each borne nine or ten children, lived to the average age of 75, and the 13 mothers of eleven or twelve children each lived to the average age of 78 years.[67]

Powys' elaborate study of the general vital statistics of New South Wales, including both the poorer and more prosperous classes, led him to the conclusions that "the advantage in longevity is distinctly in favor of mothers of moderate sized families of about six children," that "fertility up to about eight children is apparently favorable to longevity, whilst unfavorable beyond that number," and that "mothers of moderate sized families of about six live on the average longer than those with smaller or larger families." [68]

The fact that maternal longevity is associated statistically with very large or fairly large families in Bell's, Jones', Cattell's, and Powys' data does not, of course, imply that longevity is the result of prolific child-bearing. It does show how unscientific and unwarrantable it is to draw from slum statistics the sweeping conclusion that the bearing of a normal or fairly large family is necessarily and of itself, apart from poverty, ignorance, medical neglect, and other factors, prejudicial to the life and health of the mother. Whether a mother will be short-lived or long-lived depends on many things besides the smaller or larger number of children she has borne. Two of these things, "spacing" and individual differences, will be considered in the following paragraphs.

What is proper "spacing" between child-bearing? Obstetricians and gynecologists are very cautious about answering this question with precision. So much depends on the individual mother's condition. A frequency that might prove a drain upon

the physical energies of some mothers is not at all such for others. An interval of about two years between births is sometimes mentioned as being Nature's spacing.[69] This is about the spacing that actually obtains on the average among mothers under thirty years of age, where birth restriction is not practised. Such at least seems to appear fairly clear from our available statistical data. But an average *de facto* rate does not necessarily imply a natural law or rule. The statistical studies of the relation between spacing and infant mortality show a two-year period between births as correlated with a lower mortality rate, but our statistical studies to date fall very far short of being a thorough-going analysis of the complex social, economic, psychological, and physiological factors, apart from spacing itself, that lie back of and are responsible for the crude statistical correlation.[70] A little more light may be thrown on the question by the facts of nursing and weaning.

Spacing

According to recent American surveys, the death rate among artificially fed infants under one year of age, is from three to five times as great as it is among breast-fed infants, the rate varying according to the age of the infant and according to hygienic, economic, and industrial conditions. The Baltimore survey showed a rate from three to nine times as high among the bottle-fed. European studies show similar results. Breast-fed infants, moreover, show a much lower disease rate than do artificially fed ones.[71]

Maternal Nursing

The reasons for this lower mortality and disease rate are many. The mother's milk is always warm and is aseptic. It contains not only nourishment, but also living ferments and vitamins. "There is something in mothers' milk," writes DeLee, "that the finest chemistry cannot find nor imitate—a life-giving something—and it helps the baby to digest and assimilate the supplied food." According to recent studies, the mother's milk acts as an antitoxin and vaccine that protects the new-born baby against

disease germs. In addition, natural nursing helps normal involution of the uterus and other tissues involved in pregnancy and labor, and, from the social and educational standpoint, stimulates the maternal instinct of the mother and promotes attachment of the child to the mother and lays the foundation for the moral training of the child.[72]

In view of the modern statistical and physiological evidence, it is very difficult for the moralist by any subtle casuistry to exculpate the mother who deliberately evades for any but the most imperative reasons the task of maternal nursing. There are, it is true, a small percentage of mothers who, on account of physiological or pathological reasons, cannot or ought not to nurse their own infants. But most mothers can and certainly ought. Obstetricians are, to the writer's best knowledge, unanimous in regarding maternal nursing as a duty. A mother who can fulfill this maternal task and who nevertheless evades it in order to be freer to come and go or for other self-regarding motives, is chargeable either with gross maternal illiteracy or with still more gross maternal callousness.

This seeming digression from our subject is not in reality a digression. The question of maternal nursing is intimately bound up with the question of spacing and with the whole problem of birth restriction, although it is generally passed over in silence in contraceptive and anti-contraceptive literature.

Conception and Maternal Nursing

A nursing mother is very much less apt to conceive during the normal nursing period than is the mother who does not nurse. During lactation the uterus and ovaries become to a greater or lesser degree quiescent and cease to functionate, thus bringing about a seemingly protective temporary sterility which safeguards the mother against having to bear simultaneously the double strain of lactation and gestation.[73]

In the three thousand and more cases studied and recorded by Mayer, Remfry, Essen-Möller, Heil, Fordyce, Tibone,

Jacobius, Bendix, and Roche, when the mother nursed her child the menses did not return until some time after the beginning of the fourth month following labor in over three out of four cases, and not until from the beginning of the seventh month to a year or more in nearly two out of three cases.[74]

Moreover, in the first place, account has to be taken of the fact that the menses are less apt to return at an early date when the child is entirely breast-fed than when it is only partly breast-fed.[75] Secondly, where menstruation begins during lactation, it is quite commonly very irregular—in about one-half to three-fourths of the cases, if we may generalize from the observations made independently by Remfry and Tibone.[76] Thirdly, according to independent observations made by Heil, Fordyce, Tibone, and Jacob, in later lactations, particularly from the third on, amenorrhea is "decidedly commoner" than in first and second lactations—about twice as common in later lactations, according to Heil's and Tibone's observations.[77]

Where, on the other hand, the mother does not nurse her infant, the menses return ordinarily about the sixth week after labor. Mayer, for instance, found that among his more than five hundred cases of non-nursing mothers, menstruation returned in 76% of them by the end of the sixth week and in 95% of them by the end of the third month.[78]

Ovulation, which must precede conception, may occur without menstruation, but conception is unusual during amenorrhea. As Graves expresses it: "Lactating women during the amenorrheic period do not often conceive." Fordyce concludes from his own studies that "conception is rare within the first six months of lactation and uncommon before the eighth month."[79]

For the sake of clearness we may summarize the foregoing paragraphs on menstruation, ovulation, and conception in a few words. Evidently nature intended that ovulation and conception should not occur during lactation. Where the mother nurses her child regularly without any supplementary feedings of artificial food, ovulation and conception do not occur in the

great majority of cases. Where ovulation and conception do occur, obstetricians feel that in most cases the nursing has not been carried out completely.

The bearing of the foregoing data upon the birth control problem is obvious. Ordinarily an infant does best if weaning is completed about the end of the ninth or tenth month. If the mother does not nurse her own child, conception becomes possible and may occur within a comparatively short time after labor. If, however, she does nurse her own child for the normal six to nine months period, conception is very much less apt to occur until after the weaning period is ended. The nine months of gestation and the nine months of lactation added bring spacing up to about a year and a half between conceptions, and usually conception does not take place until some months after weaning. Thus where the mother nurses her infant a spacing of at least two years between births is more common.

"If the woman's object in avoiding lactation is a selfish one, *e. g.,* to give herself the opportunity of being away from her child for long periods of time, or to preserve her figure, she will almost always show further evidence of her selfishness by artificially avoiding another conception at the early date, which absence of lactation would otherwise render probable." [80] Dr. Routh is here apparently referring to the well-to-do English classes and is perhaps making too sweeping a generalization, but there is, no doubt, enough of factual basis to his statement to drive home the close interrelation between the avoidance of lactation and the avoidance of parenthood. Were maternal nursing viewed, as it unquestionably should be on physiological and moral grounds, in the light of an ethical obligation, we should have a much less acute problem to face in the matter of artificial birth control, and far fewer mothers would be in the dilemma of birth restriction, or too frequent child-bearing. As matters stand, when obstetricians have difficulty in getting perfectly healthy mothers of the well-to-do classes to nurse their children even for a few weeks, the evasion of the obvious obligation of

maternal nursing leads in numberless cases to the evasion of further parenthood itself.

It has been made evident, we hope, that while fidelity on the part of the mother to her own child's deepest interests cries out for maternal nursing on a far wider scale than is practised today among both the poorer and the wealthier classes in our modern civilization, nevertheless the loyal and unselfish acceptance of this task by all mothers in a position to accept it would not entirely solve the problem of spacing. There would still remain exceptional cases, where further child-bearing, for a time at least, might be gravely prejudicial to the life or health of an individual mother. Such cases certainly occur at present, and their treatment, whether from an ethical or a medical standpoint, calls for the most sympathetic and humane consideration.

The Individual Case

Regarding the individual case, it is quite true that modern obstetrical knowledge and prenatal and natal technique have greatly cut down the sufferings and hazards of child birth. It is quite true also that some physicians are too ready to advise postponement of further conception on trivial grounds, and that the dangers forecasted often do not actually materialize. Nevertheless there are very real individual cases when further conception may mean death or grave invalidism for the mother. What can be done in such a case?

There is only one possible solution, whether we consider the question from the physical or the ethical standpoint, and that is the solution of marital continence. If a man's wife and the mother of his children is in danger from further child-bearing, be such danger temporary or not, there is but one means that will guarantee and assure protection of her health and life, and that means is continence. There is no infallible method of artificial birth restriction as usually understood, and intelligent birth control advocates themselves know

Marital Continence

this perfectly well. The following, for instance, is from a convinced contraceptionist, Dr. Edith Hooker: the currently used contraceptive methods "are all more or less offensive to persons of refined disposition and are by no means certain to achieve their objective. Many persons who have consistently practiced birth control by one or another of these methods have produced large families without the slightest desire or intention." And, incidentally, she adds: "Moreover, after the children have been born, their parents have in an astonishing number of instances rejoiced at the new members of their household and have found that they could support additional offspring contrary to their expectation." [81]

To call continence in such cases asceticism is simply to misuse the English language. The Century Dictionary, for example, defines "ascetic" as "practising special acts of self-denial as a religious exercise; seeking holiness through self-mortification; hence, rigidly abstinent and self-restrained as to appetites and passions." This is about the ordinary acceptation of the term ascetic or asceticism. What identity there is between the seeking of holiness through rigid self-mortification and the safeguarding of a beloved wife's and mother's health and life by the only means that can assuredly safeguard it, may be left to those who so misuse the term to make out.

That continence in married life is easy, no one but a fool would hold. But no one except a fool ever held that living up to lofty, unselfish ideals of life is easy. The greatest Teacher and Exemplar of such lofty ideals of life said very distinctly that the way thereto is narrow and steep and thorny. Continence, when continence is the only means by which a man can protect the life and health of his wife and the mother of his children, may call for all the manhood in him. It calls for no asceticism.

Such continence is not easy. It *is* possible. And it is actually practised far more than is often imagined. To look upon sex hunger as an overmastering impulse which will brook no

control within the marital bond is to justify prostitution and infidelity. At certain times, as within the weeks immediately following childbirth, the carrying out of marital relations would be brutal cruelty. Would we care to plead in defence of the unprincipled wretch who is disloyal to his wife during her very confinement? What, too, of the cases and circumstances where a wife is ill or an invalid over long periods, or where husband and wife are separated for months at a time? Are commercial travelers and army and navy men by the very fact of their separation from their wives unfaithful? What, too, of recently bereaved widows and widowers?

That some psychical harm many result to the super-sexed under such conditions of self-control is just possible, if there be an underlying pathological emotional condition. The Freudian evidence may seem to point in this direction. That such harm will result, if the individual be otherwise stable emotionally, remains yet to be proven. We have yet to get a shred of scientific evidence that sex self-control is hurtful under ordinary conditions, and it is the general consensus of the informed medical profession that continence is not hurtful.[82] Moreover, even were it proven that in exceptional but normally stable individuals some psychic harm might result from such self-control, we should have to say that here, as often in ethical matters, the individual interest has to give way to the broader interests of the many. And this brings us to our concluding section and a brief consideration of what we may call the wedge principle in ethics.

CHAPTER IX

Conclusion

In many matters that concern morality and human welfare, the acquiescence in and approval of exceptions to a general ethical or social standard of conduct is a first break in the dam. Through such a break, small though it be at first, the devastating floods of mischief pour in progressively increasing volume. There are, no doubt, exceptional cases where, for instance, the vendetta, or lynch law, or polygamy, or infanticide, or outright slander, or deliberate betrayal of confidence might promote individual or collective welfare, even under civilized conditions. Admit, however, such exceptions as ethical, and you open up a first fissure in the solid masonry that holds back the impounded waters, the first small fissure that widens and widens until the destroying flood sweeps down the valleys below.

Wedge Principle in Ethics

Such wedge action, as we may call it, tends to be operative particularly where, on the one hand, human interests and hungers of high driving power urge for satisfaction, and where, on the other hand, there prevails no impartial moral standard or unbiased tribunal to determine whether, in view of deeper and broader considerations of human welfare, the more egoistic interests and hungers should be released and satisfied or else inhibited and controlled. The actual decision and course of action tends to be along lines suggested by the egoistic interests and cravings themselves rather than along lines demanded by altruistic ethics. The individual human animal is a proverbially poor judge in his own cause.[83]

Perhaps in no field of human activity is the operation of this

wedge action more obvious than in the race-preservative field of sex and parenthood, of home and family life. Divorce, for example, was rare in early Greece and Rome. But once admitted as under certain conditions ethical, it spread apace among the upper and middle classes until it split in twain the domestic life of classic civilization. We witness around us to-day the same divorce wedge driving deeper and ever deeper into our own modern family life. The divorce rate is progressively increasing with a deadly consistency in nearly every occidental nation into which divorce has been introduced.[84] It has progressively increased in our own United States until in some sections one out of every two or three marriages ends in dissolution by divorce. Nor have we any good reason to expect that the wedge will not penetrate still deeper in the coming years.

The same sinister wedge action is unmistakably apparent in the matter of artificial birth control. The consistently progressive decline in fertility and the birth rate among those sections of our modern western culture that have adopted the theory and practice of contraception is a matter of common knowledge and has been dealt with in the preceding chapters. Masterful interests and cravings, unchecked by uncompromising standards of conduct or by competent impartial tribunals, have already brought about gravely anti-social and dysgenic results that are deplored even by most thinking contraceptionists themselves.

To admit contraception as under some circumstances ethical and at the same time to counsel "moderation" and adequate fulfillment of responsibilities is worse than playing with fire. It is starting a conflagration. The evidence jumps at us from every fence corner. Such a program might conceivably work out in practice with some other race on some other planet. But we are concerned with our own race on this our own planet, and no sociological fact rests on a firmer observational and statistical basis than the fact that practically and in reality the groups that admit and practice contraception, for whatsoever reason and in whatsoever exceptional situations, do not practice it in "modera-

tion," nor have we a single workable suggestion that offers a ghost of a hope that we can ever get them to practice it in "moderation." The wedge, once allowed entrance, pierces ever deeper and deeper.[85]

The Catholic position that holds artificial birth control as admitting no exception does unquestionably call at times for self-mastery of a high order, but, on the other hand, it is the one position that can adequately and in practice safeguard individual and collective welfare. It may and does involve in exceptional cases an unselfishness that borders upon the heroic, but, if through exceptions the wedge be permitted entrance at all, in the end the very foundations of the home will be split asunder. It may and does involve sometimes real sacrifice on the part of the individual, but the wellbeing and higher interests of the many are thereby protected. It may and does involve in certain instances some immediate hardship, but in the long run human welfare is incalculably promoted.[86]

As in the matter of the indissolubility of the marital tie, so, too, in this matter of the decency of the marital relation, the Catholic Church is uncompromisingly championing an unpopular cause. She is championing the cause out of a deep sense of loyalty to the best and highest human welfare. She will continue to champion it uncompromisingly regardless of consequences to herself.

In so doing she is actuated by no motives of a trivial or superficial nature. Most of the literature on contraception both pro and con shows little or no appreciation of the deeper issues at stake. The Catholic Church is concerned for the maintenance in wholesome integrity of the race-preservative sphere because it is one of the most basic if not the most basic thing in human life and society. Her intimate and agelong experience has given her a keen realization of the crucial position that the sex and parental impulses hold in human life, and that the home and the family hold in human society. Recent advances in the psychological, psychiatrical, and social fields are corroborating in un-

expected ways this traditional Catholic view, for they are shedding new and brilliant light upon the paramount importance and wide-pervading influence of the sex and parental impulses in making or marring human character, and of home and family life in building or blasting human society.

Birth Control and Catholic Theology

Most non-Catholics and some Catholics themselves seem to labor under the impression that the Catholic position on birth control is grounded on purely "theological" bases, whatever be meant by that. In reality, the Catholic position is a corollary of the religious and moral principle common to many or most of the religions and philosophies of humanity, the principle of love of neighbor, of concern for human welfare, both individual and collective. The misunderstanding occurs because the corollary, like many other ethical corollaries, especially in the sex sphere, is not so obvious to the casual observer. The corollary is a long circuit conclusion from the premise of neighborly love rather than a short circuit conclusion.

The Catholic position on birth control no doubt articulates with and is organically linked up to Catholic faith and theology —but in a manner totally different from that commonly supposed. We may do well to outline this articulation briefly. The outline will also serve as a partial summary of the long and complicated discussion which has formed the body of the present study.

a. God's Concern For Human Welfare

God is our Father. He loves us. He is concerned for our temporal as well as for our eternal welfare. His moral law is no arbitrary set of rules. It is the product of His love for us. It is a code that guides man's relations to his Father in heaven and to his brethren on earth. So far as our brethren on earth are concerned, the moral law furthers human welfare by protecting human rights and by fulfilling human needs. God is coerced by

His very concern for our earthly welfare to insist without favoritism upon universal democratic fidelity to His moral law.

Birth control hurts human welfare most obviously by leading to underpopulation and extinction where it is practised. But it hurts human welfare perhaps even more profoundly in subtler and less obvious ways. In its essential tendencies, it eliminates from marital life the very elements that throw about that life the mantle of the sacred and the reverent. In the long run, it undermines higher love itself. It thus tends to break down the loftier reverence and love between husband and wife. It isolates physical sex gratification from its normal unselfish accompaniments and correctives, centers attention upon the self-regarding phases of sex, and helps to enthrone selfishness and flabbiness at the very heart of character. It reduces the marital relation to a level not superior to or different from the level of solitary vice and extra-marital indulgence. It robs the child of the natural education that comes from growing up as one of many equals in a normally-sized family. In a word, birth control tends to destroy the finer flower of human character, the higher functions of family life, the loftier sentiments of human mating, and the inner sanctities of the home.

God, as our Father, is also our divine Educator. Our life here is a living project in which we grow and develop in contact with our fellowmen by practising unselfish loyalty to them in their rights and needs. The moral history of mankind is the record of this ancient and perennial divine education of humanity in unselfish love.

b. God's Plan for Human Moral Education

Schools are only a small fraction of the human educational system. All life is a school, and it is in this divinely planned school of life that our higher selves are "drawn out" and expanded and developed towards the ideal of unselfish living that is the core of the Christian concept of life.

In this divinely planned educational project, no element holds a more central place than the element of sex and parenthood.

The race-preservative impulses in our lives are, with the exception of the physical sex drive, primarily unselfish and other-regarding, as the self-preservative impulses are primarily selfish and self-regarding. It is out of the higher elements of love and parental devotion within the race-preservative complex that spring most if not nearly all of the natural unselfish trends and tendencies and driving forces in our lives.

Parental love, paternal and maternal devotion and sacrifice, marital love, fraternal love, and probably neighborly love itself, have their natural origin in and get their natural driving power from the higher elements in the race-preservative instinct and impulses.[87] Our education and development in loving our neighbor as ourselves is largely and probably fundamentally the "drawing out" and expansion and sanctification of inborn and inherited unselfish impulses and forces arising from and closely associated with the higher elements of love and parental driving powers in our nature.

Physical sex gratification is self-regarding. Love and the parental impulses are other-regarding. God's educational strategy in our regard consists, in large measure and probably fundamentally, in utilizing our more selfish physical sex-trends to urge us into the task of home-building and child-rearing, the task that awakens and calls out and stimulates into activity the great latent, unselfish love-trends in our nature. Home-building and child-rearing call forth unselfish devotion of mate to mate and of parents to offspring throughout the greater expanse of adult life. The responsibilities and sacrifices of child-rearing are the factors in the schooling of character that urge into action the sleeping courage and hardihood and robustness that else may readily remain asleep or atrophy. These responsibilities and sacrifices urge into action and sustain at high tension the unselfish love for others that gives to humanity its radiant tinge of the divine.[88]

Artificial birth control evades and undercuts this whole project. Those who practise contraception do indeed gratify selfish

physical sex desires, but while so doing evade child-bearing and child-rearing, the very element in the project that educates and develops hardihood and unselfishness. If we may speak of the practice in theological language, we may say that it sets at naught and frustrates and eludes a fundamental and perhaps the fundamental divine plan for our higher moral education, for our development and growth in unselfish love.

And yet, even this seeming outwitting of Nature is a short-lived victory. Nature has reserve strategies by which she outmanœuvers us in our puny and short-sighted evasions of her laws. Nature speaks to us as a rule in the persuasive words of natural wisdom. But nature speaks when she must in language less soft and gentle. Against those who will not hearken to the laws of life, she urges one last argument. It is decisive, final, ruthless, inexorable. It is not an argument of words or of ideas. It is an argument of fact. It is the argument of death. Here are two statements of it, the one biological, the other ethical.

The Iron Law of Survival

"Unfortunately this [race suicide] is not a case of mere difference of opinion between men; it is a case of antagonism between men and nature. If a race hypnotize itself into thinking that its views about race suicide are superior to nature's views, it may make its own end a little less painful; but it will not postpone that end for a single minute. The contest is to the strong, and although numbers are not the most important element in strength, it is very certain that a race made up of families containing one child each will not be the survivor in the struggle for existence." [89]

"It might be said that the faithful followers of the higher Ethics cannot convince their opponents; they can only breed them out! Thus will they fulfil the word of the Ethical Teacher: 'The meek shall possess the land.'" [90]

One recent moderate advocate of birth control, while frankly recognizing the breeding-out consequences of contraception,

strikes a somewhat more hopeful note. "Birth control will ultimately have a selective effect on the population in that the selfish and unpatriotic will have a better opportunity to eliminate themselves and leave the world to more normal and wholesome stocks." [91] If so, some strange possibilities are suggested.

Survival and Moral Fitness

The vast Catholic multitudes, in holding out from high motives of conscience against the easier way of birth control, are being forced regretfully into a contest for survival with the groups who practise contraception. Will the Catholic multitudes survive in the contest, as more than one recent writer is intimating? [92] And if they survive, will it be because they will have shown themselves less "selfish and unpatriotic," "more normal and wholesome," and hence morally fitter to survive?

It all reminds us vaguely of one of the most pregnant passages in modern literature: "If we do revive and pursue the pagan ideal of a simple and rational self-completion we shall end —where Paganism ended. I do not mean that we shall end in destruction. I mean that we shall end in Christianity." [93]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography may seem unnecessarily lengthy. It is appended to the foregoing text for the convenience of any reader or study circle desiring to take up phases of the family limitation problem in greater detail than was advisable in the text.

Augustine, St., *De nuptiis et concupiscentia,* in Migne, Patrol. latina, v. 44.

Austin, O. P., art., "Population," in *The Encyclopedia Americana,* 1920, xxii.

Babcock, E. B., and Clausen, R. E., *Genetics in Relation to Agriculture,* N. Y., 1918.

Baker, O. E., and Strong, H. M., *Arable Land in the United States,* separate from Yearbook of Dept. of Agric., 1918, Washington, 1919.

Baker, O. E., "Land Utilization in the United States," in *Geographical Review,* Jan., 1923, xiii, 1-26.

Barrett, Florence E., *Conception Control,* N. Y., 1922.

Bell, A. G., (a) *The Duration of Life and Conditions Associated with Longevity,* Washington, 1918. (Abstracts also in *Journal of Heredity,* July, 1917, viii, 299-302.)

Bell, A. G., (b) "Is Race Suicide Possible?" in *Journal of Heredity,* 1920, xi, 339-341.

Boas, F., "Eugenics," in *Scientific Monthly,* 1916, iii, 471-478.

Bolduan, C., "All-America Conference on Venereal Diseases: Report," U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, 1921.

Booth, M., "Religious Belief as Affecting the Growth of Population," in *Hibbert Journal,* 1914, xiii, 138-154.

Brown, J. W., Greenwood, M., and Wood, F., "The Fertility of the English Middle Classes: A Statistical Study," in *Eugenics Review,* 1920, xii, 158-211.

Bureau, P., *L'indiscipline des mœurs,* Paris, 1921.

Cannan, E., (a) *A History of the Theories of Production and Distribution in English Political Economy From 1776 to 1848,* London, 1894.

Cannan, E., (b) *Wealth,* London, 1914.

Carr-Saunders, A. M., *The Population Problem: A Study in Human Evolution,* Oxford, 1922.

Cattell, J. McK., "Families of American Men of Science," in *Popular Science Monthly,* 1915, lxxxvi, 504-515, and *Scientific Monthly,* 1917, iv, 248-262, and v, 368-377.

"Child Care and Child Welfare," Bull. 65, Home Econ. Ser. No. 5, Fed. Board for Vocat. Educ., Washington, 1921.

Coe, G. A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education,* N. Y., 1917.

Cooper, J. M., (a) "Human Welfare and the Monogamous Ideal," in *Social Hygiene,* 1920, vi, 457-467.

Cooper, J. M., (b) "Mint and Cummin," in *Catholic Charities Review,* 1922, vi, 43-47.

Cox, H., *The Problem of Population,* N. Y. and London, 1923.

Crossen, H. S., *Diseases of Women,* 5th ed., St. Louis, 1922.

Crum, F. S., "The Decadence of the Native American Stock," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1914, xiv, 215-222.

Darwin, L., "Population and Civilisation," in *Economic Journal,* 1921, xxxi, 187-195.

Dauchez, H., "Pour la France de demain," in *Revue prat. d'apol.,* 1915, xx, 109-112, 625-632.

Davis, K. B., "A Study of the Sex Life of the Normal Married Woman," in *Journal of Social Hygiene,* 1922, viii, 173-189.

DeLee, J. B., *Obstetrics for Nurses,* 6th ed., Phila., 1923.

Devas, C. S., *Political Economy,* 2d ed., London, 1901.

District of Columbia Minimum Wage Cases, Supreme Court of the U. S., Oct. term, 1922, Brief for Appellants, 2 vols., 1922 (National Consumers' League, N. Y. C.).

Douglas, P. and D., "What Can a Man Afford?" in *American Economic Review,* Dec., 1921, xi, Suppl. No. 2, 1-94.

Drysdale, C. V., *The Small Family System,* N. Y., 1914.

Dublin, L. I., (a) "The Significance of the Declining Birth Rate," repr. in *Congressional Record,* Jan. 11, 1918, 888-890.

Dublin, L. I., (b) "Birth Control," repr. from *Social Hygiene,* Jan., 1920, vi.

Duncan, J. M., *Fecundity, Fertility, Sterility and Allied Topics,* Edinburgh, 1866.

Dunlop, J. C., "The Fertility of Marriage in Scotland: A Census Study," in *Journal Royal Statistical Society,* London, 1914, lxxvii, 259-288.

Durand, E. D., (a) "Some Problems of Population Growth," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1916, xv, 129-148.

Durand, E. D., (b) "Agriculture in Eastern Europe," in *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 1922, xxxvi, 169-196.

East, E. M., and Jones, D. F., *Inbreeding and Outbreeding,* Phila., 1919.

East, E. M., (a) "Population," in *Scientific Monthly,* 1920, x, 603-624.
East, E. M., (b) "The Agricultural Limits of Our Population," *ibid.,* 1921, xii, 551-557.
East, E. M., (c) "Population in Relation to Agriculture," in *Eugenics in Race and State,* Scientific papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Baltimore, 1923, ii, 215-232.
Essen-Möller, E., "Ueber das Verhalten der Menstruation während des Stillens," in *Zentralbl. f. Gynaekol.,* Leipzig, 1906, xxx, 175-178.
Ewart, R. J., (a) "The Aristocracy of Infancy and the Conditions of Its Birth," in *Eugenics Review,* 1911, iii, 143-69.
Ewart, R. J., (b) "The Influence of Parental Age on Offspring," *ibid.,* 201-232.
Exner, M. J., *The Physician's Answer,* N. Y., 1913.
Foerster, F. W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem,* tr., N. Y. [1912].
Fordyce, A. D., "The Importance of a Strictly Limited Lactation," in *The Lancet,* vol. i of 1906, Jan. 27, 1906, 221-223.
Freud, S., *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis,* N. Y., 1920.
Gadsby, M., "Engineers' Report on Industrial Waste," in *Monthly Labor Review,* 1921, xiii, 7-17 (493-503).
Galloway, T. W., *The Sex Factor in Human Life,* N. Y., 1921.
Gerrard, T. J., *The Church and Eugenics,* 3d ed., Oxford, 1921.
Gide, C., and Rist, C., *A History of Economic Doctrines,* tr. from 2d rev. ed. of 1913, London, 1915.
Gilchrist, C. A., "Our National Prosperity: Distribution of Property and Income," in *Scientific Monthly,* 1916, iii, 361-376.
Gillin, J. L., *Poverty and Dependency,* N. Y., 1921.
Graves, W. P., *Gynecology,* 2d rev. ed., Phila., 1921.
Guyer, M. F., *Being Well-born,* Indianapolis, 1916.
Heil, K., "Laktation und Menstruation," in *Monatschr. f. Geburtsh. u. Gynäk.,* 1906, xxiii, 340-355.
Hibbs, H. H., Jr., (a) "Infant Mortality and the Size of the Family," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1915, xiv, 629-641.
Hibbs, H. H., Jr., (b) "The Mother and Infant Mortality," *ibid.,* 1916, xv, 66-79.
Hill, J. A., "Comparative Fecundity of Women of Native and Foreign Parentage in the U. S.," *ibid.,* 1913, xiii, 583-604.
Hoffman, F. L., *The Significance of a Declining Death Rate,* Newark, N. J., 1914.
Hooker, E. H., *The Laws of Sex,* Boston, 1921.
Hourwich, I. A., *Immigration and Labor,* 2d rev. ed., N. Y., 1922.
Howell, W. H., *A Text-book of Physiology,* 3d ed., Phila., 1910.

Hoyt, H., "The Inequality in the Distribution of Wealth and Income in the U. S.," in *Journal American Statistical Association,* 1923, xviii, 650-651.

Hunt, H. R., "The Allegheny College Birth Rate," in *Journal of Heredity,* 1923, xiv, 51-60, 139-144.

Ingram, J. K., *A History of Political Economy,* new ed., London ,1915.

Jacobius, S., "Beobachtungen an stillenden Frauen," in *Archiv f. Kinderheilkunde,* 1908, xlviii, 67-74.

Johnson, R. H., and Stutzmann, B., "Wellesley's Birth-rate," in *Journal of Heredity,* 1915, vi, 250-253.

Jones, C. E., "A Genealogical Study of Population," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1918, xvi. 201,219.

Jordan, E., "Religion et natalité," in *Revue du clergé français,* 1918, xcvi, 338-355, 416-431, and 1919, xcvii, 29-48, 81-95.

Kelly, H. A., quoted in *Harper's Weekly,* Oct. 16, 1915, lxi, 380.

Kerby, W. J., *The Social Mission of Charity,* N. Y., 1921.

Knibbs, G. H., (a) *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1911,* 2 vols., i, Appendix A, "The Mathematical Theory of Population," Melbourne, 1917.

Knibbs, G. H., (b) "The Problems of Population, Food Supply and Migration," in *"Scientia,"* Bologna, 1919, xxvi, 485-495.

Körösi, J., An Estimate of the Degrees of Legitimate Natality as Derived from a Table of Natality Compiled by the Author from his Observations made at Budapest, in *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. of London,* v. 186 (B) for year 1895, London, 1896, 781-875.

Leroy-Beaulieu, P., *La question de la population,* 2d ed., Paris, 1913 (1915).

Lewis, C. J. and J. N., *Natality and Fecundity,* Edinburgh and London, 1906.

Lorand, A., *Life Shortening Habits and Rejuvenation,* Phila., 1922.

McClanahan, H. M., "The Relative Morbidity of Breast and Bottle Fed Infants," in *Archives of Pediatrics,* 1918, xxxv, 653-660.

McDougall, W., *An Introduction to Social Psychology,* 13th ed., Boston, 1918.

McNabb, V., "Toward Truer Ethics," in *Ecclesiastical Review,* 1915, lii, 197-207.

Manly, B. M., *Are Wages Too High?* Washington, 1922.

March, L., "The Fertility of Marriages According to Profession and Social Position," in *Problems in Eugenics,* First International Eugenics Congress, London, 1912, 208-220.

Marchant, J., ed., *The Control of Parenthood,* N. Y. and London, 1920.

Marshall, A.. *Principles of Economics,* 6th ed., London, 1910.

Marshall, F. H. A., *The Physiology of Reproduction,* 2d rev. ed., London, etc., 1922.

Martin, G. W., "The Food Resources of the Sea," in *Scientific Monthly,* 1922, xv, 455-467.

Mayer, L., "Statistische Beiträge zur Häufigkeit der Menstruation während des Stillens," in *Beiträge z. Geburtsh. u. Gynäkol.,* Berlin, 1872-3, II. Bd., Original-Aufsätze, 136-42.

Mitchell, W. C., King, W. I., Macaulay, F. R., and Knauth, O. W., *Income in the United States: Its Amount and Distribution 1909-1919,* vol. i. Summary. N. Y., 1921.

National Birth-Rate Commission, First Report, *The Declining Birth-Rate,* London, 1916.

National Birth-Rate Commission, Second Report, *Problems of Population and Parenthood,* N. Y., 1920.

Nearing, N. S., "Education and Fecundity," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1914, xiv, 156-174.

Newsholme, A., *The Declining Birth-Rate: Its National and International Significance,* N. Y., 1911.

Ogburn, W. F., "The Standard-of-Living Factor in Wages," in *American Economic Review,* Mar., 1923, supplem., xiii, 118-129.

O'Hara, F., "The Malthusian Principle of Population, in *Catholic University Bulletin,* 1914, xx, 278-295, 388-402.

Pearl, R., and Reed, L. J., "On the Rate of Growth of the Population of the United States since 1790 and its Mathematical Representation," in *Proc. Nat. Acad. of Sci. of U. S. A.,* 1920, vi, 275-288.

Pearl, R., (a) "The Population Problem," in *Geographical Review,* 1922, xii, 636-645.

Pearl, R., (b) "Some Eugenic Aspects of the Problem of Population," in *Eugenics in Race and State,* Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Baltimore, 1923, ii, 212-214.

[Phillips, J. C.], "Harvard and Yale Birth Rates," in *Journal of Heredity,* 1916, vii, 565-569.

Popenoe, P., and Johnson, R. H., *Applied Eugenics,* N. Y., 1920.

Powys, A. O., "Data for the Problem of Evolution in Man: On Fertility, Duration of Life and Reproductive Selection," in *Biometrika,* vol. iv, pt. iii, Nov., 1905, 233-285.

Remfry, L., "The Effects of Lactation on Menstruation and Impregnation in *Trans. Obstetr. Soc. of London* for 1896, London, 1897, xxxviii, 22-27.

Rossiter, W. S., "The Adventure of Population Growth," in *Journal American Statistical Association,* 1923, xviii, 561-574.

Ryan, J. A., (a) art., "Population, Theories of," in *Catholic Encyclopedia,* 1911, xii, 276-280.

Ryan, J. A., (b) art., "Poverty and Pauperism," *ibid.,* 327-330.

Ryan, J. A., (c) "Open Letter to Birth Control League," in *Catholic Mind,* June 22, 1915, xiii, 331-336. (Repr. by *America Press,* N. Y., 1920.)

Ryan, J. A., (d) "Family Limitation," in *Ecclesiastical Review,* 1916, liv, 684-696. (Repr. by Paulist Press, N. Y., 1916.)

Ryan, J. A., (e) "Birth Control," repr. from *Catholic Charities Review,* vol. i, 1917, in Ryan, *The Church and Socialism and Other Essays,* Washington, 1919, 217-235.

Ryan, J. A., (f) "The Attitude of the Church Towards Birth Control," in *Catholic Charities Review,* 1920, iv, 299-301.

Save the Youngest, Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, rev. ed., 1921.

Schrott-Fiechtl, H., *Ursberg und seine Wohltätigskeits-Anstalten,* Donauwörth, 1920ca.

Slater, T., "Eugenics and Moral Theology," ch. xiv of *Questions of Moral Theology,* N. Y., 1915.

Smith, J. R., *The World's Food Resources,* N. Y., 1919.

Soule, G., (a) "Is There Enough Work and Income to Go Round?" in *Proceedings National Conference of Social Work at Providence 1922,* Chicago, 1922, 305-309.

Soule, G., (b) "The Productivity Factor in Wage Determinations," in *American Economic Review,* supplem., March, 1923, xiii, 129-140.

Sprague, R. J., (a) "Education and Race Suicide," in *Journal of Heredity,* 1915, vi, 158-162.

Sprague, R. J., (b) "Constructive Aspect of Birth Control," *ibid.,* 1917, viii, 58-62.

Stangeland, C. E., *Pre-Malthusian Doctrines of Population,* N. Y., 1904.

Sutherland, H. G., *Birth Control: A Statement of Christian Doctrine Against the Neo-Malthusians,* N. Y., 1922.

Taylor, G., "The Distribution of Future White Settlement," in *Geographical Review,* 1922, xii, 375-402.

Thomas Aquinas, St., *Summa theologica.*

Thompson, W. S., (a) *Population: A Study in Malthusianism,* N. Y., 1915.

Thompson, W. S., (b) "Race Suicide in the U. S.," in *Scientific Monthly,* 1917, v, 22-35, 154-165, 258-269.

Thompson, W. S., (c) "Race Suicide in the U. S.," in *American Journal of Physical Anthropology,* 1920, iii, 97-146.

Thomson, A., "Problems Involved in the Congress of the Sexes in Man," in *British Medical Journal,* London, Jan. 7, 1922, 5-8.

Tibone, P., "Sui rapporti fra mestruazione, allattamento e lattante," in *Rassegna d'ostetricia e ginecologia,* Napoli, Jan. 31, 1913, xxii, 129-151.

Todd, A. J., *Theories of Social Progress,* N. Y., 1919.

Tugendreich, G., "Über den Einfluss des Stillens auf die Empfängnis," in *Sexual-Probleme,* Frankfurt a. M., 1908, iv, 459-464.

Van Blarcom, C. C., *Getting Ready to be a Mother,* N. Y., 1923.

Vermeersch, A., *De castitate,* Rome and Bruges, 1919.

West, Mrs. M., *Prenatal Care,* 4th ed., Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, 1915.

Westergaard, H., *Die Lehre von der Mortalität und Morbilität,* 2d ed., Jena, 1901.

Westermarck, E., *The History of Human Marriage,* 3 vols., 5th ed., N. Y., 1922.

Whetham, W. C. D. and C. D., (a) *The Family and the Nation,* London, 1909.

Whetham, W. C. D. and C. D., (b) *An Introduction to Eugenics,* Cambridge, 1912.

Willcox, W. F., (a) "The Nature and Significance of the Changes in the Birth and Death Rates in Recent Years," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1916, xv, 1-15. (*Cf.* also *Journal of Heredity,* 1916, vii, 119-127.)

Willcox, W. F., (b) "On the Future Distribution of White Settlement," in *Geographical Review,* 1922, xii, 646-647.

Woodbury, R. M., (a) "Infant Mortality Studies of the Children's Bureau," in *Quarterly Publications American Statistical Association,* 1918, xvi, 30-53.

Woodbury, R. M., (b) *Infant Mortality and Preventive Work in New Zealand,* Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, Washington, 1922.

Woods, R. A., and Kennedy, A. J., *The Settlement Horizon,* N. Y., 1922.

Yule, G. U., *The Fall of the Birth-Rate,* Cambridge, 1920.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 For fuller treatment, see Cooper, a.

2 On Catholic teaching regarding mid-menstrual abstinence, see Vermeersch, 261; Sutherland, 153; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 1st Report, 391. On the disputed physiological data, see F. H. A. Marshall, 132-3; Barrett, 39; Vermeersch, 9-10; Graves, 59-60; Child Care and Child Welfare, 22—especially Marshall, Graves, and Barrett.

3 For fuller data on the Catholic position regarding contraceptive methods, see Ryan, d, 684-7; Ryan, e, 228; Vermeersch, 217, 261, 266-78. On Catholic view regarding "avalanche of babies," see Jordan, 45-7.

4 Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 1st Rpt., 69. *Cf.* Foerster, 99. The use of the adjective "instinctive" in the quotation is in the present state of our psychological and sociological knowledge inexact or at least open to exception. Such repugnances may perhaps better be called social intuitions.

5 For further data, see East and Jones, 244; Babcock and Clausen, 553, 581-2.

6 St. Thomas, 2a 2æ, Q. 154, art. 9; Freud, 176-7, 290ss.

7 See, for instance, Thomson, 8; Graves, 113-4; Sutherland, 83-7; Marchant, 125-6; Lorand, pt. i, ch. x, and pt. ii, ch. vii; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., 245-6.

8 *Cf.* Galloway, 15-16.

9 Shaw cited by Sutherland, 93; Kelly, 380; St. Augustine, cap. xv.

10 Woods and Kennedy, 281-2.

11 Our best treatments of the parental impulses are McDougall, 68-84, in ch. iii; Coe, 123-29.

12 Newsholme, 59-60.

13 The best statements to the writer's knowledge of the psychological and educational aspects of contraception are those of Ryan, c, 332-5; d, 690-2; e, 235; f, 300; and of Foerster, ch. vii. *Cf.* also Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., p. l, and Coe, 216.

14 *Cf.* Westermarck, iii, 366-7, for summary of evidence.

15 Willcox, b, 646.

16 *Cf.* Devas, 199, on India, and Durand, b, on Eastern Europe.

17 Hoffman, 36-7; Pearl, a, 641-4. For source data, *cf. Statistical Annuals of International Institute of Agriculture* and *Yearbooks* of U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.

18 Smith, 566.

19 In addition to sources to be cited in following pages, *cf.* Austin, 368; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 1st Rpt., 42; Dublin, b, 11.

20 Taylor, 400; Pearl and Reed, 285-6. *Cf.* Baker, 4-5.

21 East, b, 555-7.

22 Baker and Strong; Baker, 15.

23 Baker, 7-8, 14-5, 24.

24 Baker, 4-5.

25 Baker, 24-5; Knibbs, b, 493-4. *Cf.* certain restrictions noted by Durand, a, 130-9.

[26] See especially Smith, ch. xxv-xxvi and *passim*. On sea resources, *cf.* Martin; and East, a, 619, with East, c, 219.

[27] Leroy-Beaulieu, 60, 62; A. Marshall, 180, note; Knibbs, b, 494-5; East, c, 217; Pearl, b, 214; Taylor, 402.

[28] Knibbs, b, 485-6. East's estimate (c, 216) is an average annual increase of 0.7% during last century, and a current increase of 0.9%.

[29] Knibbs, b, 485.

[30] Leroy-Beaulieu, 1-2; Rossiter, 562-3; Yule, 35.

[31] Carr-Saunders, 309, and ch. vii-xi. Carr-Saunders' work is perhaps our best historical and prehistorical study of population.

[32] A. Marshall, 182-7; Carr-Saunders, 264-6, 278-85.

[33] For summary of evidence, see Newsholme, ch. iv, 29-35. Yule's recent theory to the contrary (32-7) does not seem very convincing. See also the evidence of contraception in references under note No. 64.

[34] Körösi, 792-800; Dunlop, 265-6; Lewis, 29-32, 44; Knibbs, b, 488-9; Powys, 256-76. Duncan's earlier data on Scotland can be dispensed with in view of Lewis' and Dunlop's studies.

[35] *Cf.* the data on chastity in Westermarck, i, ch. iv, 126-59, with any good treatise on ethnology. For some further data on primitive chastity, see Father W. Schmidt's *Die Stellung der Pygmäenvoelker*, Stuttgart, 1910, 155-65.

[36] See Westermarck, i, 160-5.

[37] Sprague, a, 158-9; Dublin, a, 889, and b, 7; Whetham, a, 122-3, and b, 59; Thompson, b, 268. *Cf.* also National Birth-Rate Comm., 1st Rpt., 328.

[38] Our original sources of evidence are very numerous. For summary reviews of the evidence, see, for instance, Popenoe and Johnson, 259-69; Sprague, a, 160-1; Nearing, art.; Hunt, 53-5; Cattell, 260-1. See also Crum, 216-9; Cattell, 250; Phillips, 566; Johnson and Stutzmann, 250; Brown, Greenwood, Wood, 199-203; Bureau, 184-5; Dauchez, 626-30 (these last two particularly for the French conditions). The writer does not mean to imply that the low birth rates observed and reviewed by the foregoing authorities are due entirely to voluntary birth restriction. Other factors are also undoubtedly at work, but the evidence adduced by Newsholme, 29-35, and others (*cf.* Popenoe and Johnson, 269-70), and the evidence that comes to us from questionnaire studies of the subject (see references under note No. 64) can leave little doubt that the declining fertility of the educated and well-to-do classes is in the main the result of voluntary restriction, and more commonly voluntary restriction by contraceptive measures.

[39] On the differential birth rate among various classes and sections, see for United States, Thompson, c, 97-101 and *passim;* Hill, art.; Crum, 216; Popenoe and Johnson, 138-9; for England, see Yule, 31; for France, see March, art.; for general European data, see summary in Popenoe and Johnson, 140-3.

[40] Willcox, a, 11-2.

[41] Schrott-Fiechtl; Gerrard, 28-9. *Cf.* Slater, 268-71; Ryan, d, reprint, 17-22.

[42] Todd, 266. Compare Guyer, 308. For a review of the persistent but futile efforts to increase the birth rate of the Roman citizenry under the Empire, see Stangeland, 32-9.

[43] Bell, b.

[44] *Cf.* Crum, 220-1.

[45] Smith, 527.

[46] See, for instance, Cannan, b, 40-71 (*cf.* Cannan, a, 123-82); Devas, 58-64. *Cf.* short statement in Austin, 368. It is well recognized, of course, that

a certain density of population is necessary for the development of higher civilization. Without such density, it is difficult if not impossible to build up the surplus wealth which is the material basis of civilization. To determine just what density is necessary is not an easy task. In fact, the whole question of what constitutes the optimum population is involved by numerous complexities and hypotheses.

47 See short treatments of this complex subject in Carr-Saunders, 301-7, 313, and Leroy-Beaulieu, 292-4.

48 Mitchell, King, *et al.*, 68, 147. On the data of Mitchell for 1918, the Douglases, pp. 89-93, have calculated incomes for 1921. *Cf.* also Soule, a, 306.

49 Gilchrist, 364-6; Hoyt, 650-1. Hoyt's estimates of surplus income are based on data in Mitchell, King, 134-6.

50 Ogburn, 135; Manly, 19; Soule, b, 131-3.

51 Manly, whole pamphlet; Child Care and Child Welfare, 304-5; Ogburn, 123-8; Douglas, 49-55. For review of all evidence on women's wages, see D. C. Minimum Wage Cases, Brief for Appellants, ii, 687-1022, and short summary of some of evidence in Cooper, b, 43-5.

52 On causes of poverty, see, for example, Gillin, 50-119; Kerby, 10-34; or short summary by Ryan, b.

53 A summary of the conclusions of the Hoover committee is given in Gadsby, esp. pp. 13-4.

54 *Cf.* Popenoe and Johnson, 276; Thompson, a, 164, and especially Ryan, e, 180-216, essay on False and True Welfare.

55 See Gide and Rist, 134-6; Ingram, 118-9; O'Hara, 294-5; Devas, 198-200; Ryan, a, 279.

56 Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., p. li.

57 Tables in Woodbury, b, 2, 23. On Sweden and New South Wales, see Woodbury, b, 2, 23, and Powys, 277, 281-4; on Connaught, Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., lxxxix; on French departments, Sutherland, 41-2. *Cf.* Popenoe and Johnson, 272. "The correspondence between low birth rates and low infant death rates is by no means a close one," Woodbury, b, 24.

58 Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., lxxxix.

59 Child Care and Child Welfare, 16-19; Hibbs, b, 71, 75; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., 377. *Cf.* Willcox, b, 646, on health as purchasable. As an excellent concrete study of the factors responsible for high infant mortality rates and of practical measures for reducing these rates, see Woodbury, b.

60 Hibbs, a, 629-33, for summary of greater part of evidence to date.

61 Bell, a, 47; Cattell, 374-5.

62 Hibbs, a, 631, 633.

63 The point will be treated more in detail *infra*. *Cf.*, meanwhile, Popenoe and Johnson, 272-3; Powys, 277; Westergaard, 268-71; Woodbury, a, 47.

64 On motives as stated in answers to questionnaires, see Davis, 175; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 1st Rpt., 323, 330-1; Brown, Greenwood, 199-203. On more general and fuller studies of motives, see especially Thompson, c, 118-39; b, 154-65, 258-64; Jordan, 341-55; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., 394-6. *Cf.* Hourwich, 226.

65 Leroy-Beaulieu, 403, 411.

66 Newsholme, 39-40; Boas, 477-8; Crum, 221.

67 Jones, 207; Bell, a, 37; Cattell, 370.

68 Powys, 239-40, 244, 247.

69 Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., xcili, 284.

70 *Cf.* Westergaard, 366-71; Hibbs, a, 637-41; Woodbury, a, 43-7; Ewart, a, 151; b, 211-3.

71 Child Care and Child Welfare, 72; Woodbury, a, 38-9; McClanahan, art.

72 DeLee, 176, 405; "Science," Jan. 12, 1923, lvii, p. ix; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., xci-xciii, 286, 376-7; McClanahan, 660.

73 Graves, 543, 560, 56.

74 A careful tabulation of the results of their observations of 3,204 cases gives us the following averages. Total amenorrhea persisted throughout the whole of the nursing period in 48.9% of all cases. Nursing mothers were amenorrheic until after the end of the third month after childbirth in 76.6% of the 2,293 cases in which information was obtained, and were amenorrheic until from the end of the sixth month to a year or more in 62.3% of the 1,262 cases in which information was obtained.

The total record and percentage for the 3,204 cases is based on Mayer, 137-8; Remfry, 24; Essen-Möller, 176; Heil, 344; Fordyce, 221; Tibone, 130; Bendix (cited by Heil, 343); Roche (cited by Tibone, 130). The percentage for the 2,293 cases is derived from the data given by Remfry, Bendix, Essen-Möller, Tibone, Mayer, Jacobius, and Fordyce; that for the 1,262 cases from Essen-Möller, Tibone, Mayer, Fordyce, and Jacobius. In computing the last two of the three percentages, proportionate allowance was made for the fact that in a stated number of their own cases, Mayer and Essen-Möller knew that the lactating mother had menstruated, but did not know the exact date when the menses first returned. Had such allowance not been made in the computation, the percentages would have been 78.2% and 66.6% instead of 76.6% and 62.3% as in the preceding paragraph.

Some data of a non-statistical nature bearing on the relation of lactation to menstruation may be found in Crossen, 827, 830; Graves, 571; F. H. A. Marshall, 69, 600; Van Blarcom, 135; West, 31-2; Howell, 927; Child Care and Child Welfare, 67. Crossen, for instance, sums up the question as follows, p. 838: "As a rule, a woman does not menstruate while nursing a baby. There are, however, many exceptions to this rule, especially after the first six months. Quite frequently a patient, while nursing her child, will begin to menstruate within five or six months after labor and occasionally within two or three months. This happens most frequently in those cases in which the mother has only enough milk to partly nourish the baby."

75 Crossen, 838.

76 Remfry, 24; Tibone, 130.

77 Heil, 346, and citing Jacob, 344; Fordyce, 222-3; Tibone, 131, and citing Jacob, *ibid.* Essen-Möller did not find evidence of the fact in his own cases, 177.

78 Mayer, 138; Remfry, 26.

79 Graves, 571, 59-60; Fordyce, 223; DeLee, 39; Howell, 930; Child Care and Child Welfare, 27; Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., 287; F. H. A. Marshall, 638, 132-3. Remfry (26) drew from his own observations the conclusion that the chances of conception are only one-tenth as great among nursing mothers who are amenorrheic as among nursing mothers who have begun to menstruate.

80 Nat. Birth-Rate Comm., 2d Rpt., 285.

81 Hooker, 95.

82 Exner, 14; Vermeersch, 33-6; Bureau, 294-302. *Cf.* Bolduan, 40-2.

83 *Cf.* Foerster, 52-6, on value of "forms"; Todd, 265-6, on optional polygamy.

84 Westermarck, iii, 364.

85 Some couples consider that after they have borne three or four children they have done their part. In reality, if all couples should adopt this practice, numerical racial decline would result, inasmuch as an *average* of about four children is required to keep numbers stationary, and many couples on account of age or supervening sterility cannot produce four children. Moreover, were such a practice given ethical sanction, we should leave a clear way open for the operation of the wedge principle just touched upon in the text. Finally, such a practice is open to practically all the anti-social consequences we have dealt with in the earlier chapters of this study, particularly in chapter three.

86 Foerster, ch. vii, especially p. 105.

87 McDougall, 68-84.

88 Cooper, a, 462-3.

89 Popenoe and Johnson, 256-7.

90 McNabb, 207.

91 Sprague, b, 60.

92 Popenoe and Johnson, 273; Booth, 154, 142, and *passim;* Ryan, c, 335.

93 G. K. Chesterton, *Heretics,* N. Y. and London, 1909, 170. The whole chapter contains, beneath the author's characteristic tomfoolery, an interesting evaluation of the ethics of "self-realization."

02531110R

NLM 05017476 4

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE